

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0057542		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/22/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/11/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/26/2015

### 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: Orthopedic Surgery

### 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 47 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on November 22, 2011. He has reported right knee pain and has been diagnosed with bilateral knee internal derangement and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment has included medications, medical imaging, surgery, physical therapy, and modified work duty. Currently the injured worker had tenderness over the paraspinal musculature. Exam note 2/25/15 demonstrates patient is status post right knee arthroscopy. Exam of the left knee demonstrates range of motion from 0 to 130. MRI of the knee 1/25/15 demonstrates tricompartmental osteoarthritic changes with thinning of the medial meniscus. The treatment request included urgent left knee arthroscopy.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**URGENT Left Knee Arthroscopy:** 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): 344-345. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and Leg, Arthroscopic Surgery for Osteoarthritis.

**Decision rationale:** CAMTUS/ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints, pages 344-345, states regarding meniscus tears, "Arthroscopic partial meniscectomy usually has a high success rate for cases in which there is clear evidence of a meniscus tear; symptoms other than simply pain (locking, popping, giving way, recurrent effusion); clear signs of a bucket handle tear on examination (tenderness over the suspected tear but not over the entire joint line, and perhaps lack of full passive flexion); and consistent findings on MRI." In this case the MRI from 1/25/15 demonstrates osteoarthritis of the knee without clear evidence of meniscus tear. The ACOEM guidelines state that, "Arthroscopy and meniscus surgery may not be equally beneficial for those patients who are exhibiting signs of degenerative changes." According to ODG, Knee and Leg Chapter, Arthroscopic Surgery for osteoarthritis, "Not recommended. Arthroscopic lavage and debridement in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee is no better than placebo surgery, and arthroscopic surgery provides no additional benefit compared to optimized physical and medical therapy." As the patient has significant osteoarthritis the determination is for non-certification for the requested knee arthroscopy.