

Case Number:	CM15-0091211		
Date Assigned:	05/15/2015	Date of Injury:	06/19/2014
Decision Date:	06/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/12/2015

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: Arizona, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/19/2014. Current diagnoses include status post left knee arthroscopy, micro fracture arthroscopy, and partial medial meniscus tear. Previous treatments included medication management, and left knee arthroscopy. Previous diagnostic studies include an MRI arthrogram of the left knee performed on 03/16/2015 and MRI of the left knee performed on 08/01/2014. Report dated 03/23/2015 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included persistent pain and swelling of the left knee. Pain level was not included. Physical examination was positive for abnormal findings in the left knee. The treatment plan included recommendation of Monovisc Hyaluronic injection, and requests for Relafen and Tramadol. Disputed treatments include Monovisc Hyaluronic injection for the left knee.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Monovisc Hyaluronic Injection for the left knee: 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).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG - knee chapter and pg 36.

Decision rationale: Criteria for Hyaluronic acid injections: Patients experience significantly symptomatic osteoarthritis but have not responded adequately to recommended conservative non-pharmacologic (e.g., exercise) and pharmacologic treatments or are intolerant of these therapies (e.g., gastrointestinal problems related to anti-inflammatory medications), after at least 3 months. Documented symptomatic severe osteoarthritis of the knee according to American College of Rheumatology (ACR) criteria, which requires knee pain and at least 5 of the following: (1) Bony enlargement; (2) Bony tenderness; (3) Crepitus (noisy, grating sound) on active motion; (4) Erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) less than 40 mm/hr; (5) Less than 30 minutes of morning stiffness; (6) No palpable warmth of synovium; (7) Over 50 years of age; (8) Rheumatoid factor less than 1:40 titer (agglutination method); (9) Synovial fluid signs (clear fluid of normal viscosity and WBC less than 2000/mm³); Pain interferes with functional activities (e.g., ambulation, prolonged standing) and not attributed to other forms of joint disease; Failure to adequately respond to aspiration and injection of intra-articular steroids; Generally performed without fluoroscopic or ultrasound guidance; Are not currently candidates for total knee replacement or who have failed previous knee surgery for their arthritis, unless younger patients wanting to delay total knee replacement. (Wen, 2000) Repeat series of injections: If documented significant improvement in symptoms for 6 months or more, and symptoms recur, may be reasonable to do another series. No maximum established by high quality scientific evidence; In this case, the claimant did not have joint swelling or crepitus. The gait was normal the criteria for arthritis was not met and the claimant's diagnosis was a micro-fracture of the knee and menisectomy. The request for a Monovisc injection is not medically necessary.