

Case Number:	CM15-0125447		
Date Assigned:	07/13/2015	Date of Injury:	08/21/2013
Decision Date:	09/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/05/2015
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 54 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/21/2013. He reported stepping on a pipe, twisting the knee and falling. Diagnoses include lumbar radiculopathy, right meniscal tear, and closed head injury with memory loss, irritability and unsteadiness, status post right knee chondroplasty on 5/16/14. Treatments to date include activity modification, medication therapy, physical therapy and cortisone injections. Currently, he complained of right knee pain. He uses a cane for ambulation and an unloader knee brace. On 4/23/15, the physical examination documented significant tenderness along the medial joint line and effusion. The plan of care included medial unicompartmental arthroplasty and associated services including an assistant for outpatient surgery, commode, dynamic compressions device, home physical therapy with RN evaluation twice a week for two weeks, single point cane, front wheeled walker, cold therapy unit and post-operative physical therapy twice a week for six weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Outpatient surgery: right medial unicompartmental arthroplasty: 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), Knee and Leg Procedure Summary online version, Criteria for knee joint replacement.

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 unicompartmental knee replacement. According to the ODG Knee and Leg section, unicompartmental knee replacement is an option if one compartment is involved. Guideline criteria for knee arthroplasty includes conservative care consisting of supervised therapy or home exercise program and medications, plus documentation of limited range of motion. In addition, complaints of night joint pain, no pain relief with conservative care and documentation of current functional limitations when the patient is over 50 years of age with a body mass index of less than 35. In addition there must be documentation of significant loss of chondral clear space in at least 1 of 3 compartments. In this case, there is significant disagreement between the treating physician and the radiologist as to the extent of disease in the lateral compartment. There is no weight bearing x-ray submitted to assess the degree of arthritis. The request for unicompartmental arthroplasty is not medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: 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.

Associated surgical service: Home physical therapy with RN evaluation 2x2 visits: 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 surgical service: Cold therapy unit: 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 surgical service: front wheeled walker: 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 surgical service: single point cane: 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 surgical service: Dynamic compression device: 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 surgical service: 3 in 1 commode: 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 surgical service: postoperative physical therapy 2x6 (12 visits): 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.