

Case Number:	CM13-0024347		
Date Assigned:	11/20/2013	Date of Injury:	04/26/2012
Decision Date:	01/03/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/06/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/16/2013

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. The expert reviewer is a licensed Doctor of Chiropractic, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture, and is licensed to practice in California. 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 physician 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/services.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

Claimant is a 42 year old female who suffered a work related injury on 4/26/2012. Her primary diagnoses are synovitis, carpal tunnel, paresthesias, Dequervains. She has had oral mediations, braces, physical therapy, multiple steroid injections and acupuncture. On a PR-2 dated 8/5/2013, the PTP notes that the claimant has had 7/8 approved acupuncture treatments with no improvement. She has continued pain wrist, elbow, shoulder and head. The prior determination noted that on 9/5/2013, the staff of the primary treating physician noted that the doctor had not requested continued acupuncture.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Continued acupuncture x 6 for cervical: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: According to evidenced based guidelines, further acupuncture visits after an initial trial are medically necessary based on documented functional improvement. The claimant has had 7 acupuncture treatments with no improvement at all. Furthermore, it appears that the PTP did not intend to request continued acupuncture. Therefore further visits are not medically necessary. The request for continued acupuncture x 6 for cervical is not medically necessary and appropriate.

