DECISION AND ORDER

This case is decided pursuant to Chapter 410 of the Texas Workers’ Compensation Act and Rules of the Division of Workers’ Compensation adopted thereunder.

ISSUE

A contested case hearing was held on May 12, 2009, to decide the following disputed issue:

1. Is the preponderance of the evidence contrary to the decision of the Independent Review Organization (IRO) that Claimant is not entitled to a left knee arthroscopy for the compensable injury of ________?

PARTIES PRESENT

Claimant appeared and was represented by STS, attorney. Carrier appeared and was represented by HDP, attorney.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On __________, Claimant sustained a compensable injury to her left knee. Claimant has had three MRI's on her left knee on the dates of September 21, 2007, December 20, 2007 (MR Arthogram), and September 30, 2008. Claimant has had one arthroscopy to her left knee on March 31, 2008. She now seeks a second left knee arthroscopy in the form of a meniscectomy according to her treating doctor. Claimant herein appeals the adverse decision of the IRO.

Texas Labor Code Section 408.021 provides that an employee who sustains a compensable injury is entitled to all health care reasonably required by the nature of the injury as and when needed. Health care reasonably required is further defined in Texas Labor Code Section 401.011 (22a) as health care that is clinically appropriate and considered effective for the injured employee's injury and provided in accordance with best practices consistent with evidence based medicine or, if evidence based medicine is not available, then generally accepted standards of medical practice recognized in the medical community. Health care under the Texas Workers' Compensation system must be consistent with evidence based medicine if that evidence is available. Evidence based medicine is further defined in Texas Labor Code Section 401.011 (18a) to be the use of the current best quality scientific and medical evidence formulated from credible scientific studies, including peer-reviewed medical literature and other current scientifically based texts and treatment and practice guidelines.

In accordance with the above statutory guidance, the Division of Workers' Compensation has adopted treatment guidelines by Division Rule 137.100. This rule directs health care providers to provide treatment in accordance with the current edition of the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), and such treatment is presumed to be health care reasonably required as defined in the
Texas Labor Code. Thus, the focus of any health care dispute starts with the health care set out in the ODG.

Under Meniscectomy, the ODG provides:

Recommended as indicated below for symptomatic meniscal tears. Not recommended for osteoarthritis (OA) in the absence of meniscal findings. (Kirkley, 2008) Meniscectomy is a surgical procedure associated with a high risk of knee osteoarthritis (OA). One study concludes that the long-term outcome of meniscal injury and surgery appears to be determined largely by the type of meniscal tear, and that a partial meniscectomy may have better long-term results than a subtotal meniscectomy for a degenerative tear. (Englund, 2001) Another study concludes that partial meniscectomy may allow a slightly enhanced recovery rate as well as a potentially improved overall functional outcome including better knee stability in the long term compared with total meniscectomy. (Howell-Cochrane, 2002) The following characteristics were associated with a surgeon's judgment that a patient would likely benefit from knee surgery: a history of sports-related trauma, low functional status, limited knee flexion or extension, medial or lateral knee joint line tenderness, a click or pain noted with the McMurray test, and a positive Lachmann or anterior drawer test. (Solomon, 2004) Our conclusion is that operative treatment with complete repair of all torn structures produces the best overall knee function with better knee stability and patient satisfaction. In patients younger than 35, arthroscopic meniscal repair can preserve meniscal function, although the recovery time is longer compared to partial meniscectomy. Arthroscopy and meniscus surgery will not be as beneficial for older patients who are exhibiting signs of degenerative changes, possibly indicating osteoarthritis, and meniscectomy will not improve the OA. Meniscal repair is much more complicated than meniscal excision (meniscectomy). Some surgeons state in an operative report that they performed a meniscal repair when they may really mean a meniscectomy. A meniscus repair is a surgical procedure done to repair the damaged meniscus. This procedure can restore the normal anatomy of the knee, and has a better long-term prognosis when successful. However, the meniscus repair is a more significant surgery, the recovery is longer, and, because of limited blood supply to the meniscus, it is not always possible. A meniscectomy is a procedure to remove the torn portion of the meniscus. This procedure is far more commonly performed than a meniscus repair. Most meniscus tears cannot be treated by a repair. See also Meniscal allograft transplantation. (Harner, 2004) (Graf, 2004) (Wong, 2004) (Solomon-JAMA, 2001) (Chatain, 2003) (Chatain-Robinson, 2001) (Englund, 2004) (Englund, 2003) (Menetrey, 2002) (Pearse, 2003) (Roos, 2000) (Roos, 2001) Arthroscopic debridement of meniscus tears and knees with low-grade osteoarthritis may have some utility, but it should not be used as a routine treatment for all patients with knee osteoarthritis. (Siparsky, 2007) Arthroscopic surgery for knee osteoarthritis offers no added benefit to optimized physical and medical therapy, according to the results of a single-center, RCT reported in the New England Journal of Medicine. The study, combined with other evidence, indicates that osteoarthritis of the knee (in the absence of a history and physical examination suggesting meniscal or other findings) is not an indication for arthroscopic surgery and indeed has been associated with inferior outcomes after arthroscopic knee surgery. However, osteoarthritis is not a contraindication to arthroscopic surgery, and arthroscopic surgery remains appropriate in patients with arthritis in specific situations in which osteoarthritis is not believed to be the primary cause of pain. (Kirkley, 2008) Asymptomatic meniscal tears are common in older adults, based on studying MRI scans
of the right knee of 991 randomly selected, ambulatory subjects. Incidental meniscal findings on MRI of the knee are common in the general population and increase with increasing age. Identifying a tear in a person with knee pain does not mean that the tear is the cause of the pain. (Englund, 2008) Arthroscopic meniscal repair results in good clinical and anatomic outcomes. (Pujol, 2008) Whether or not meniscal surgery is performed, meniscal tears in the knee increase the risk of developing osteoarthritis in middle age and elderly patients, and individuals with meniscal tear were 5.7 times more likely to develop knee osteoarthritis. (Englund, 2009)

**ODG Indications for Surgery™ — Meniscectomy:**

Criteria for meniscectomy or meniscus repair (Suggest 2 symptoms and 2 signs to avoid scopes with lower yield, e.g. pain without other symptoms, posterior joint line tenderness that could just signify arthritis, MRI with degenerative tear that is often false posit[ivel]e):

1. **Conservative Care:** (Not required for locked/blocked knee.) Physical therapy. OR Medication. OR Activity modification. PLUS
2. **Subjective Clinical Findings (at least two):** Joint pain. OR Swelling. OR Feeling of give way. OR Locking, clicking, or popping. PLUS
3. **Objective Clinical Findings (at least two):** Positive McMurray's sign. OR Joint line tenderness. OR Effusion. OR Limited range of motion. OR Locking, clicking, or popping. OR Crepitus. PLUS
4. **Imaging Clinical Findings:** (Not required for locked/blocked knee.) Meniscal tear on MRI.

(Washington, 2003)

Claimant's treating doctor prepared a report for purposes of this hearing which uses conclusingory statements of findings to conform to the 3rd indication of the ODG Guidelines for meniscectomy. To meet the 4th indication above, the treating doctor further states the "MRI 9/3/08 is positive for abnormalities consistent with medial and lateral meniscal tears." However, Carrier provided testimony from a peer review doctor which is persuasive that Claimant did not meet the 3rd and 4th indications for surgery above. The peer review doctor testified that Claimant did not meet the 3rd indication for surgery above because of the absence in Claimant's records of treatment of at least two of the "Objective Clinical Findings". Additionally, the peer review doctor testified that Claimant does not meet the 4th indication because she does not have a locked/blocked knee and likewise does not have a "Meniscal tear on MRI". Therefore, Claimant failed to provide evidence based medicine to overturn the findings of the IRO.

Even though all the evidence presented was not discussed, it was considered. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are based on all of the evidence presented.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The parties stipulated to the following facts:

A. Venue is proper in the (City) Office of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers’ Compensation.

B. On ____________, Claimant was the employee of (Employer), when she sustained a compensable injury.
2. Carrier delivered to Claimant a single document stating the true corporate name of Carrier, and the name and street address of Carrier’s registered agent, which document was admitted into evidence as Hearing Officer’s Exhibit Number 2.

3. A left knee arthroscopy is not health care reasonably required for the compensable injury of ___________.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers’ Compensation, has jurisdiction to hear this case.

2. Venue is proper in the (City) Office.

3. The preponderance of the evidence is not contrary to the decision of the IRO that Claimant a left knee arthroscopy is not health care reasonably required for the compensable injury of ___________.

DECISION

Claimant is not entitled to a left knee arthroscopy for the compensable injury of ___________.

ORDER

Carrier is not liable for the benefits at issue in this hearing. Claimant remains entitled to medical benefits for the compensable injury in accordance with §408.021.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY; and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

RUSSELL OLIVER, PRESIDENT
6210 EAST HWY. 290
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78723

Signed this 12th day of May, 2009.

Charles T. Cole
Hearing Officer