

Case Number:	CM15-0041550		
Date Assigned:	03/11/2015	Date of Injury:	07/26/2007
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/10/2015
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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 75 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/26/2007. The diagnoses have included chondromalacia patella, cervical disc degeneration and lumbar degenerative disc. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and pain medication. According to the progress report dated 1/5/2015, the injured worker complained of chronic low back pain that radiated to the right thigh. The injured worker reported being able to walk three blocks. Objective findings documented that electromyography (EMG) was negative. The injured worker limped on the right due to knee. The treatment plan was to refill Tramadol and provide a knee brace.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Elastic knee brace with velcro: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Knee & Leg (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 340. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee Chapter, Knee brace.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for a knee brace, Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines state that a brace can be used for patellar instability, anterior cruciate ligament tear, or medial collateral ligament instability although its benefits may be more emotional than medical. Usually a brace is necessary only if the patient is going to be stressing the knee under load, such as climbing ladders or carrying boxes. For the average patient, using a brace is usually unnecessary. ODG recommends valgus knee braces for knee osteoarthritis. ODG also supports the use of knee braces for knee instability, ligament insufficiency, reconstructed ligament, articular defect repair, avascular necrosis, meniscal cartilage repair, painful failed total knee arthroplasty, painful high tibial osteotomy, painful unicompartmental osteoarthritis, and tibial plateau fracture. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has any of the diagnoses for which a knee brace is indicated, or any indication that the patient will be stressing the knee under load. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested knee brace is not medically necessary.