

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0059596		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/06/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/30/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/04/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/19/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/30/2015

### 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 44 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/30/14. He reported right knee pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having a right knee meniscal tear, status post right knee arthroscopy, and gait abnormality causing severe lumbar strain and right lower extremity radicular pain. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and on 1/27/15 the injured worker underwent a right knee arthroscopic partial medial meniscectomy and synovectomy on 1/27/15. A MRI of the right knee performed on 10/22/14 revealed a horizontal cleavage tear involving the posterior horn and body of the medial meniscus, mild arthrosis of the medial compartment, and mild mucoid degeneration within the anterior cruciate ligament without complete tear. Currently, the injured worker complains of right knee pain. The treating physician requested authorization for a MRI of the lumbar spine, additional physical therapy 2x6 for the right knee, and Tylenol refill (unspecified dose and quantity). The treating physician noted the right knee was improving but additional physical therapy was needed. A MRI of the lumbar spine is needed to rule out disc herniation. The treatment plan was to continue Tylenol.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI of the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Relying solely on imaging studies to evaluate the source of low back and related symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. Techniques vary in their abilities to define abnormalities (Table 12-7). Imaging studies should be reserved for cases in which surgery is considered or red-flag diagnoses are being evaluated. Because the overall false-positive rate is 30% for imaging studies in patients over age 30 who do not have symptoms, the risk of diagnostic confusion is great. There is no recorded presence of emerging red flags on the physical exam. There is evidence of nerve compromise on physical exam but there is not mention of consideration for surgery or complete failure of conservative therapy. For these reasons, criteria for imaging as defined above per the ACOEM have not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**Additional physical therapy 2 visits per week for 6 weeks for the right knee:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines physical medicine Page(s): 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on physical medicine states: Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision

from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices. (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007) Physical Medicine Guidelines: Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks. Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks. Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. The goal of physical therapy is graduation to home therapy after a certain amount of recommended sessions. The request is in excess of these recommendations per the California MTUS. There is no explanation why the patient would not be moved to home therapy. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**Tylenol refill (unspecified dose and qty):** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 346.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tylenol Page(s): 11.

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS section on Tylenol states: Recommended for treatment of chronic pain & acute exacerbations of chronic pain. With new information questioning the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen should be recommended on a case by-case basis. The side effect profile of NSAIDs may have been minimized in systematic reviews due to the short duration of trials. On the other hand, it now appears that acetaminophen may produce hypertension, a risk similar to that found for NSAIDs. While Tylenol is recommended as a first line treatment option for chronic pain, there are no dosing directions given for consideration. Therefore, compliance with maximum dosing cannot be ensured and the request is not medically necessary.