

Case Number:	CM15-0037722		
Date Assigned:	03/06/2015	Date of Injury:	03/01/1999
Decision Date:	04/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/27/2015

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: North Carolina
Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is a female patient, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/01/1999. A primary treating office visit dated 12/23/2014 reported subjective complaint of numb right hand and wrist pains. Objective findings showed positive Tinel's and compression tests. Range of motion to the right wrist is decreased. The following diagnoses are applied; status post distal radial fracture with open reduction and internal fixation; rule out carpal tunnel syndrome. A request was made for a magnetic resonance arthrogram of left knee. On 02/16/2015, Utilization Review, non-certified the request, noting the CA MTUS, ACOEM, ODG, Knee Complaints, Knee & Leg, Arthrography were cited. The injured worker submitted an application for independent medical review of requested services.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

MR Arthrogram of the left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): Table 13-6.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 343-347.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on knee complaints, states that MRI is indicated to determine the extent of ACL tears pre-operatively. Reliance only on imaging studies to evaluate the source of knee symptoms may carry a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a problem that was present before symptoms began, and therefore has no temporal association with the current symptoms. Even so, remember that while experienced examiners usually can diagnose an ACL tear in the non-acute stage based on history and physical examination, these injuries are commonly missed or over diagnosed by inexperienced examiners, making MRIs valuable in such cases. Criteria per the ACOEM for ordering an MRI of the knee in the provided documentation for review have not been met. Therefore, the request is not certified.