

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0116131		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/24/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/01/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/28/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/21/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/16/2015

### 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: Internal 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 36 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/01/2011. Diagnoses include patellofemoral chondromalacia, medial compartment chondromalacia and chondromalacia of the lateral tibial plateau. Treatment to date has included conservative modalities including rest, ice, anti inflammatories, analgesics, physical therapy, corticosteroid injections, and viscosupplementation. Per the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 3/18/2015, the injured worker reported achiness, stiffness and pain in the right knee. Physical examination revealed trace effusion and tenderness to palpation along the medial and lateral joint lines. There was positive patellofemoral crepitation, positive grind and pain with deep squat. The plan of care included surgical intervention (right knee diagnostic and operative arthroscopic meniscectomy vs repair possible debridement and/or chondroplasty) and authorization was requested for postoperative cold/compression unit 14 day rental and compression wrap purchase.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Cold Compression therapy unit 14 day rental:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg Chapter: Game Ready accelerated recovery system and Continuous-flow cryotherapy.

**Decision rationale:** Based on ODG guidelines, cold compression therapy is recommended as an option after surgery, but not for nonsurgical treatment. The Game Ready system combines Continuous-flow cryotherapy with the use of vaso-compression. While there are studies on Continuous-flow cryotherapy, there are no published high quality studies on the Game Ready device or any other combined system. However, in a recent yet-to-be-published RCT, patients treated with compressive cryotherapy after ACL reconstruction had better pain relief and less dependence on narcotic use than patients treated with cryotherapy alone. Continuous-flow cryotherapy is recommended as an option after surgery, but not for nonsurgical treatment. Postoperative use generally may be up to 7 days, including home use. In the postoperative setting, continuous-flow cryotherapy units have been proven to decrease pain, inflammation, swelling, and narcotic usage; however, the effect on more frequently treated acute injuries (eg, muscle strains and contusions) has not been fully evaluated. Continuous-flow cryotherapy units provide regulated temperatures through use of power to circulate ice water in the cooling packs. (Hubbard, 2004) (Morsi, 2002) (Barber, 2000) The available scientific literature is insufficient to document that the use of continuous-flow cooling systems (versus ice packs) is associated with a benefit beyond convenience and patient compliance (but these may be worthwhile benefits) in the outpatient setting. (BlueCross BlueShield, 2005) This meta-analysis showed that cryotherapy has a statistically significant benefit in postoperative pain control, while no improvement in postoperative range of motion or drainage was found. As the cryotherapy apparatus is fairly inexpensive, easy to use, has a high level of patient satisfaction, and is rarely associated with adverse events, we believe that cryotherapy is justified in the postoperative management of knee surgery. (Raynor, 2005) There is limited information to support active vs passive cryo units. Aetna considers passive hot and cold therapy medically necessary. Mechanical circulating units with pumps have not been proven to be more effective than passive hot and cold therapy. (Aetna, 2006) This study concluded that continuous cold therapy devices, compared to simple icing, resulted in much better nighttime pain control and improved quality of life in the early period following routine knee arthroscopy. (Woolf, 2008) Two additional RCTs provide support for use after total knee arthroplasty (TKA). Cold compression reduced blood loss by 32% and pain medication intake by 24%. (Levy, 1993) It improved ROM and reduced hospital stay by 21%. (Kullenberg, 2006) See also Cold/heat packs. Recent research: This systematic review concluded that solely an analgesic effect was demonstrated by the use of continuous cooling. (Cina-Tschumi, 2007) Another systematic review concluded that, despite some early gains, cryotherapy after TKA yields no apparent lasting benefits, and the current evidence does not support the routine use of cryotherapy after TKA. (Adie, 2010) Although the use of cryotherapy may not be a statistically effective modality, according to this systematic review, it may provide patient benefits. (Markert, 2011) In this case, the patient does qualify for cold compression therapy, but it is recommended for only up to 7 days. Therefore, based on ODG guidelines and the evidence in this case, the request for Cold compression therapy unit 14 day rental is not medically necessary.