

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0083649		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/05/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/06/2015
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/04/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/16/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/01/2015

### 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: Texas, Florida, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 46 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 1/06/2015. Diagnoses include chondral injury medial aspect lateral femoral condyle right knee and fraying lateral medial condyle cartilage right knee. Treatment to date has included diagnostics including magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), physical therapy, work modifications and medications. Per the Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness dated 4/09/2015, the injured worker reported right knee pain rated as 9/10 on a subjective pain scale. Physical examination of the right knee revealed significant tenderness to palpation and flexion to 90 degrees. The plan of care included injections and laboratory evaluation and authorization was requested for Creatine Phosphokinase, C-reactive protein and arthritis panel.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Creatine Phosphokinase:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, Specific Drug List & Adverse effects Page(s): 70.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriately non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

**C-Reactive Protein:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, Specific Drug List & Adverse effects Page(s): 70.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

**Decision rationale:** As shared previously, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriately non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

**Arthritis Panel:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, Specific Drug List & Adverse effects Page(s): 70.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose

diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriately non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.