

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0177582		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/18/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/17/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/21/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/18/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/09/2015

### 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, Oregon, Washington  
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:

This 50 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 7-17-14. The injured worker is being treated for meniscal tear of the knee. Treatments to date include MRI testing, right knee surgery, modified work duty, at least 10 sessions of physical therapy and prescription medications. The injured worker has continued complaints of left knee pain as well as popping and clicking. An MRI dated 12-29-14 revealed a tear of the posterior horn of the medial meniscus as well as mild chondromalacia of the patella and a small joint effusion. The pain has affected the injured worker's activity level. Upon examination, left knee range of motion is reduced. A request for Post op physical therapy x 12 and Home differential compression device for DVT prophylaxis and IF unit was made by the treating physician.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Post op physical therapy x 12: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment 2009.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Knee.

**Decision rationale:** According to the CA MTUS/Post Surgical Treatment Guidelines, Knee Meniscectomy, page 24, 12 visits of therapy are recommended after arthroscopy with partial meniscectomy over a 12-week period. The guidelines recommend initially of the 12 visits to be performed. As the request exceeds the initial allowable visits, the determination is for non-certification. The request is not medically necessary.

**Home differential compression device for DVT prophylaxis:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and Leg Chapter, Venous Thrombosis.

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

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of DVT compression garments. The ODG, Knee and Leg section, Compression Garments, summarizes the recommendations of the American College of Chest Physicians and American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons. It is recommend to use of mechanical compression devices after all major knee surgeries including total hip and total knee replacements. In this patient there is no documentation of a history of increased risk of DVT or major knee surgery. The patient underwent a routine knee arthroscopy. Therefore medical necessity cannot be established and therefore the determinations for non-certification for the requested device. The use of an outpatient pneumatic compression device is not medically necessary as it is not in accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice. While the use of a pneumatic compression device is clinically appropriate in an inpatient setting, their utility has not been demonstrated in an outpatient setting once the postoperative total knee arthroplasty patient is ambulatory. There are recommendations from the American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines (9th edition) that discuss the prevention of venous thromboembolism in orthopedic surgery patients. One of the recommendations is: "In patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty (THA) or total knee arthroplasty (TKA), we recommend use of one of the following for a minimum of 10 to 14 days rather than no antithrombotic prophylaxis: low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH), fondaparinux, apixaban, dabigatran, rivaroxaban, low-dose unfractionated heparin (LDUH), adjusted-dose vitamin K antagonist (VKA), aspirin (all Grade 1B), or an intermittent pneumatic compression device (IPCD) (Grade 1C)." There is nothing in the medical record that documents that this patient is intolerant or has a contraindication to: low-molecular-weight heparin, low-dose unfractionated heparin, or adjusted-dose vitamin K antagonist. An additional recommendation from the American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines (9th edition) is that: "In patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery, we suggest using dual prophylaxis with an antithrombotic agent and an IPCD during the hospital stay (Grade 2C)." This recommendation states that the use of an intermittent pneumatic compression device is only indicated in the inpatient setting and is not recommended in the outpatient setting once the patient is ambulatory. The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons has also released their guidelines for deep venous thrombosis prophylaxis in

arthroplasty patients. The AAOS has stated: "In the absence of reliable evidence, it is the opinion of this work group that patients undergoing elective hip or knee arthroplasty, and who also have a known bleeding disorder (e.g., hemophilia) and/or active liver disease, use mechanical compressive devices for preventing venous thromboembolism." There is no evidence on the medical record that this patient has a known bleeding disorder and/or active liver disease.

**IF unit:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Electrical stimulators (E-stim).

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the Interferential Current Stimulation (ICS), the California MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Interferential Current Stimulation, pages 118-119 state, "Not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments, including return to work, exercise and medications, and limited evidence of improvement on those recommended treatments alone. The randomized trials that have evaluated the effectiveness of this treatment have included studies for back pain, jaw pain, soft tissue shoulder pain, cervical neck pain and post-operative knee pain. The findings from these trials were either negative or non-interpretable for recommendation due to poor study design and/or methodologic issues." As there is insufficient medical evidence regarding use in this clinical scenario, the determination is for non-certification. The request is not medically necessary.