

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0041356 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 03/11/2015 | Date of Injury: | 08/30/2003 |
| Decision Date: | 05/22/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 02/12/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 03/04/2015 |

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive Medicine

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 64 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 8/30/2003. Her diagnoses, and/or impressions, included: left knee osteoarthritis with aggravation and pain from a fall; radiculopathy and/or peripheral neuropathy of the bilateral lower extremities; left knee moderate-severe medial compartment osteoarthritis and potential degenerative meniscus tear; and status-post total right knee replacement. No current magnetic resonance imaging studies are noted. Her treatments have included topical analgesic for pain. Progress notes of 2/6/2015 reported being seen for both knees, status-post right total knee replacement and recent fall, that she was doing very well with respect to her right knee; and experienced occasional mild discomfort in the left knee, legs and back. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include magnetic resonance imaging studies of the left knee. The Utilization Review notes an additional request for compound cream that is not noted on the application for Independent Medical Review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341-343. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee and Leg, MRI s (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: ACOEM notes "Special studies are not needed to evaluate most knee complaints until after a period of conservative care and observation" and "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." ODG further details indications for MRI: Acute trauma to the knee, including significant trauma (e.g, motor vehicle accident), or if suspect posterior knee dislocation or ligament or cartilage disruption. Nontraumatic knee pain, child or adolescent: nonpatellofemoral symptoms. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion) next study if clinically indicated. If additional study is needed. Nontraumatic knee pain, child or adult. Patellofemoral (anterior) symptoms. Initial anteroposterior, lateral, and axial radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional imaging is necessary, and if internal derangement is suspected. Nontraumatic knee pain, adult. Nontrauma, nontumor, nonlocalized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional studies are indicated, and if internal derangement is suspected. Nontraumatic knee pain, adult, nontrauma, nontumor, nonlocalized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs demonstrate evidence of internal derangement (e.g., Peligrini Stieda disease, joint compartment widening). Repeat MRIs: Post-surgical if need to assess knee cartilage repair tissue. (Ramappa, 2007) Routine use of MRI for follow-up of asymptomatic patients following knee arthroplasty is not recommended. (Weissman, 2011) The patient has a diagnosis of osteoarthritis of the knee. However, the medical documents do not indicate why the provider is requesting an MRI of the knee. No red flags are indicated and it is not clear how an MRI would change treatment. As such, the request for an MRI of the left knee is not medically necessary at this time.