

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0110680		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/23/1991
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/15/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/01/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/09/2015

### 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: Orthopedic Surgery

### 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 62 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 12/23/91. The injured worker was diagnosed as having knee osteoarthritis. Currently 5/20/15, the injured worker was with complaints of left knee discomfort. Previous treatments included medication management, physical therapy and intra-articular cortisone injections. Physical examination was notable for an antalgic gait, restricted range of motion of the left hip, medial and lateral joint line tenderness of the left knee and small knee joint effusion and normal ligamentous exam. The plan of care was for surgical intervention.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Total arthroplasty of the left knee:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 343-344. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Indications for surgery, Knee arthroplasty.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and Leg, Arthroplasty.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of total knee replacement. According to the Official Disability Guidelines regarding Knee arthroplasty, Criteria for knee joint replacement includes conservative care with subjective findings including limited range of motion less than 90 degrees. In addition the patient should have a BMI of less than 35 and be older than 50 years of age. There must also be findings on standing radiographs of significant loss of chondral clear space. The clinical information submitted demonstrates insufficient evidence to support a knee arthroplasty in this patient. There is no documentation from the exam notes from 5/20/15 of increased pain with initiation of activity or weight bearing. There are no records in the chart documenting when physical therapy began or how many visits were attempted. There is no evidence in the cited examination notes of limited range of motion less than 90 degrees. There is no formal weight bearing radiographic report of degree of osteoarthritis. Therefore the guideline criteria have not been met and the determination is for not medically necessary.

**3 day inpatient stay:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Hospital length of stay (LOS).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and Leg, Hospital Length of Stay.

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