

Case Number:	CM15-0086493		
Date Assigned:	05/08/2015	Date of Injury:	03/25/2012
Decision Date:	06/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/05/2015

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: 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 64-year-old female, who sustained cumulative industrial injuries from May 2007 through May 2012. She reported left shoulder pain, low back pain, left foot pain and left and right knee pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having internal derangement of the left knee, left foot pain and status post right and left knee arthroscopy. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, radiographic imaging, and surgical intervention of the right knee, conservative care, post-operative physical therapy, medications and work restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of fluctuating weight, left shoulder pain, low back pain, left foot pain and left and right knee pain. The injured worker reported an industrial injury in 2007, resulting in the above noted pain. She was treated conservatively and surgically without complete resolution of the pain. Evaluation on January 23, 2014, revealed continued pain as noted. Evaluation on March 3, 2014 indicated the injured worker remained off work. Evaluation on October 22, 2014, evaluation revealed continued pain in the left shoulder, low back radiating to the left hip, bilateral knee pain, right foot and toe pain and emotional complaints. She reported anxiety, stress and difficulty sleeping. Bilateral foot orthotics and a radiographic image of the left knee was requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRA (MRI arthrogram) of left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341, 342.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS guidelines, special studies are not needed to evaluate most knee complaints until after a period of conservative care and observation. The position of the American College of Radiology (ACR) in its most recent appropriateness criteria list the following clinical parameters as predicting absence of significant fracture and may be used to support the decision not to obtain a radiograph following knee trauma: 1) Patient is able to walk without a limp; 2) Patient had a twisting injury and there is no effusion. The clinical parameters for ordering knee radiographs following trauma in this population are: 1) Joint effusion within 24 hours of direct blow or fall; 2) Palpable tenderness over fibular head or patella. 3) Inability to flex knee to 90 degrees most knee problems improve quickly once any red-flag issues are ruled out. For patients with significant hemarthrosis and a history of acute trauma, radiography is indicated to evaluate for fracture. 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. Even so, remember that while experienced examiners usually can diagnose an ACL tear in the non-acute stage based on history and physical examination, these injuries are commonly missed or over diagnosed by inexperienced examiners, making MRIs valuable in such cases. Also note that MRIs are superior to arthrography for both diagnosis and safety reasons. There is no supporting documentation that the injured worker has failed with conservative treatment and no other imaging studies have been conducted prior to this request. Additionally, MRI is preferred to MRA. The request for MRA (MRI arthrogram) of left knee is determined to not be medically necessary.

DME: bilateral foot orthotics: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 370, 371.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines recommend the use of rigid orthotics (full shoe length inserts made to realign within the foot and from foot to leg) for patients with plantar fasciitis and metatarsalgia. Orthotics may reduce pain experienced during walking and may reduce more global measures of pain and disability. There is no evidence in the supporting documentation that the injured worker has been diagnosed with plantar fasciitis or metatarsalgia, therefore the request for DME: bilateral foot orthotics is determined to not be medically necessary.