Case Number:	CM15-0093384		
Date Assigned:	05/19/2015	**Date of Injury:**	01/12/2012
Decision Date:	06/22/2015	**UR Denial Date:**	04/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	**Application Received:**	05/14/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 39-year-old male with an industrial injury dated 1/12/2012. The injured worker's diagnoses include right knee medial and lateral meniscus tear with partial thickness anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) tear, status post arthroscopy of May 2012, left knee lateral meniscus tear with tricompartmental chondromalacia and osteoarthritis, bilateral knee tricompartmental osteoarthritis and chondromalacia and cervical myoligamentous injury. Treatment consisted of Cervical Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) dated 8/22/2013, Left shoulder MRI dated 8/22/2013, left knee/right knee MRI dated 3/18/2013, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 2/16/2015, the injured worker reported ongoing neck pain associated cervicogenic headaches, left shoulder pain, and ongoing pain in bilateral knees. The treating physician reported extensive management to bilateral knees including undergoing arthroscopic surgery to his right knee in May 2012, with symptoms still present. Objective findings revealed tenderness to palpitation along the medial and lateral joint lines and positive crepitus. The treating physician prescribed services for Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the right/left knee and Synvisc one injection to the left knee now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the right knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 341 and 343. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Knee Chapter, MRIs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341-343. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee and Leg, MRI ½ (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: ACOEM notes "Special studies are not needed to evaluate most knee complaints until after a period of conservative care and observation" and "Reliance only on imaging studies to evaluate the source of knee symptoms may carry a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a problem that was present before symptoms began, and therefore has no temporal association with the current symptoms."ODG further details indications for MRI: Acute trauma to the knee, including significant trauma (e.g, motor vehicle accident), or if suspect posterior knee dislocation or ligament or cartilage disruption. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adolescent: non- patellofemoral symptoms. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion) next study if clinically indicated. If additional study is needed. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adult. Patellofemoral (anterior) symptoms. Initial anteroposterior, lateral, and axial radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional imaging is necessary, and if internal derangement is suspected. Non-traumatic knee pain, adult. Non-trauma, non-tumor, non-localized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional studies are indicated, and if internal derangement is suspected. Non-traumatic knee pain, adult non-trauma, non-tumor, non-localized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs demonstrate evidence of internal derangement (e.g., Peligrini Stieda disease, joint compartment widening). Repeat MRIs: Post-surgical if need to assess knee cartilage repair tissue. (Ramappa, 2007) Routine use of MRI for follow-up of asymptomatic patients following knee arthroplasty is not recommended. (Weissman, 2011) The patient's injury is from 2012. The treating physician does not indicate additional information that would warrant an MRI of the knee, such as post-surgical knee assessment, re-injury, or other significant change since last MRI. The ODG guidelines advise against "routine" repeat MRI. As such, the request for MRI of the right knee is not medically necessary.

Synvisc one injection to 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), Knee Chapter, Hyaluronic acid injections.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 337-352. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee, Hyaluronic acid injections.

Decision rationale: Synvisc is a high molecular weight hyaluronan. MTUS is silent regarding the use of synvisc injections. While ACOEM guidelines do not specifically mention guidelines for usage of ultrasound guided orthovisc injections, it does state that "Invasive techniques, such as needle aspiration of effusions or prepatellar bursal fluid and cortisone injections, are not routinely indicated. Knee aspirations carry inherent risks of subsequent intraarticular infection." ODG recommends as guideline for Hyaluronic acid injections "Patients experience significantly symptomatic osteoarthritis but have not responded adequately to recommended conservative nonpharmacologic (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, which may include the following: Bony enlargement; Bony tenderness; Crepitus (noisy, grating sound) on active motion; Less than 30 minutes of morning stiffness; No palpable warmth of synovium; Over 50 years of age. 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." ODG states that "This RCT found there was no benefit of hyaluronic acid injection after knee arthroscopic meniscectomy in the first 6 weeks after surgery, and concluded that routine use of HA after knee arthroscopy cannot be recommended. Additionally, ODG states that Hyaluronic acid injections. Generally performed without fluoroscopic or ultrasound guidance." The medical documentation provided do not indicate this patient as severe osteoarthritis. The medical documentation does not meet the above guidelines. As such, the request for Synvisc one injection to the left knee is not medically necessary.

MRI of the left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 341 and 343. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG); Knee Chapter, MRIs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341-343. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee and Leg, MRI½ (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: ACOEM notes "Special studies are not needed to evaluate most knee complaints until after a period of conservative care and observation" and "Reliance only on imaging studies to evaluate the source of knee symptoms may carry a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a problem that was present before symptoms began, and therefore has no temporal association with the current symptoms."ODG further details indications for MRI: Acute trauma to the knee, including significant trauma (e.g, motor vehicle accident), or if suspect posterior knee dislocation or ligament or cartilage disruption. Nontraumatic knee pain, child or adolescent: non-patellofemoral symptoms. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion) next study if clinically indicated. If additional study is needed. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adult. Patellofemoral (anterior) symptoms. Initial anteroposterior, lateral, and axial radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional imaging is necessary, and if internal derangement is suspected. Nontraumatic knee pain, adult. Nontrauma, nontumor, nonlocalized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional studies are indicated, and if internal derangement is suspected. Nontraumatic knee pain, adult nontrauma, nontumor, nonlocalized pain. Initial anteroposterior

and lateral radiographs demonstrate evidence of internal derangement (e.g., Peligrini Stieda disease, joint compartment widening). Repeat MRIs: Post-surgical if need to assess knee cartilage repair tissue. (Ramappa, 2007) Routine use of MRI for follow-up of asymptomatic patients following knee arthroplasty is not recommended. (Weissman, 2011)The patient's injury is from 2012. The treating physician does not indicate additional information that would warrant a repeat MRI of the knee, such as post-surgical knee assessment, re-injury, or other significant change since last MRI. The ODG guidelines advise against routine repeat MRI. As such, the request for MRI of the left knee is not medically necessary.