

Case Number:	CM15-0124389		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2015	Date of Injury:	01/24/2012
Decision Date:	09/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/29/2015

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, Indiana, Oregon
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 34 year old female with an industrial injury dated 01-24-2012. The injury is documented as occurring when she bent over and felt a pop in her right knee experiencing onset of pain in the medial aspect of her knee and around the patella. Her diagnosis is persistent internal derangement, status post arthroscopic drilling. Prior treatment included prior surgery with about 50% relief, physical therapy, knee brace and medication. She presented on 04-29-2015 with right knee pain and swelling. Physical exam noted medial joint line tenderness, positive McMurray test medially and laterally, patellofemoral compression pain and one plus effusion. MRI of the right knee showed baker's cyst and joint effusion. Tear was not entirely excluded. Treatment plan included arthroscopic surgery of the right knee.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Re-look right knee arthroscopy with possible partial meniscectomy and chondroplasty:
Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 329-353. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Meniscectomy.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) knee.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of chondroplasty. According to the ODG Knee and Leg regarding chondroplasty, Criteria include ALL of the following; conservative care, subjective clinical findings of joint pain and swelling plus objective clinical findings of effusion or crepitus plus limited range of motion plus chondral defect on MRI. In this case the MRI does not demonstrate a clear chondral defect on MRI nor does the exam note demonstrate objective findings consistent with a symptomatic chondral lesion. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Associated Service: CMP: 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.

Associated Service: EGFR: 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.

Associated Service: PT: 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.

Associated Service: UA/RFLCUL: 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.

Associated Service: CBC/DIFF: 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.

Associated Service: APTT: 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.

Associated Service: ABO/RH: 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 physical therapy 2 x 6 (12 sessions): 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.