

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0164165		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/08/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/06/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/13/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/03/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/06/2014

### 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. The expert 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 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

44 year old female claimant with an industrial injury dated 12/06/12. MRI of her left knee dated 08/14/14 reveals a medial meniscus tear as well as a 5 x 5 mm chondromalacia in the high posterior medial femoral condyle characterized by partial thickness attenuation with minimal underlying subchondral sclerosis as well as focal grade 3 deep chondral fissures in the medial femoral trochlear facet and mild soft tissue edema. MRI of the right knee dated 08/14/14 reveals a medial meniscus tear and mild soft tissue edema. Exam note 09/24/14 states the patient returns with persistent knee pain. Conservative treatments have included rest, ice, anti-inflammatory, home stretching and exercises, and analgesics all in which have had no improvement on her condition. Upon physical exam of the bilateral knees there are medial and lateral joint line tenderness, patellar tendon tenderness, and positive patellar apprehension. The patient completed a positive McMurray's test. Treatment includes a left knee diagnostic and operative arthroscopy.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**12 Physical Therapy:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Post op knee brace:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Pre op clearance EKG, CXR:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Pre op medical clearance UA:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Pre op medical clearance CBC, CMP, PTT, HEP panel, HIV panel:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Assistant surgeon:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Left knee diagnostic/operative arthroscopic meniscectomy vs repair (cont'd #2), (cont'd #1 possible debridement and/or chondroplasty): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 344-345. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee and Leg, Meniscectomy

**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). According to ODG Knee and Leg section, Meniscectomy section, states indications for arthroscopy and meniscectomy include attempt at physical therapy and subjective clinical findings, which correlate with objective examination and MRI. In this case the exam notes from 9/24/14 do not demonstrate evidence of adequate course of physical therapy or other conservative measures. In addition there is lack of evidence in the cited records of meniscal symptoms such as locking, popping, giving way or recurrent effusion. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.