

Case Number:	CM13-0002523		
Date Assigned:	12/11/2013	Date of Injury:	12/05/2001
Decision Date:	01/24/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/09/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/22/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in orthopedic surgery and is licensed to practice in California. 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 physician 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/services.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This injured worker had a 2001 right knee injury and subsequent 2002 right knee arthroscopy. The records document a June 18, 2013 right knee Synvisc-One injection with follow-up office visit July 13, 2013. At the follow-up visit he was two weeks post injection and the provider indicated though the claimant did "not like me" for the first two days he reported some relief. The claimant requested additional injections which is what is in question at this time.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right knee Synvisc one joint injection (x 48 units): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee Chapter and Criteria for Hyaluronic acid injections.

Decision rationale: The requested right knee Synvisc-One injection is not medically necessary based on review of the medical record. While viscosupplementation can be used in patients who have underlying arthritis who have failed other appropriate conservative care, usually repeat injections are not done unless patients have had good improvement for four to six months and then have worsening of their condition. In light of the fact there are no follow-up office visits after just a couple of weeks following his previous June 18, 2013 injection to review, then there is no way to know whether the patient's condition has actually worsened over time. There is also no way to know whether or not the initial injection actually gave good long term relief. Therefore, in light of these issues, the requested repeat viscosupplementation injection is not medically necessary.

