

Case Number:	CM13-0027345		
Date Assigned:	11/27/2013	Date of Injury:	07/17/2009
Decision Date:	01/27/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/09/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/20/2013

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 Chiropractor and Acupuncturists 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 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/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 was involved in a work related injury on 7/17/2009. Her primary diagnosis is brachial neuritis. She has neck pain, headaches, left upper extremity symptoms, low back pain, right lower extremity symptoms and right knee pain. Prior treatment includes physical therapy, acupuncture, and oral medications. MRI findings show that she has 5 mm central and left posterior paracentral L5-S1 disc protrusion, 2mm disc bulge at C5, mild synovial thickening of subacromial bursa, Claimant had at least 13 prior sessions of acupuncture from 9/24/10-5/6/2011 with documentation of no improvement.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Acupuncture two (2) times a week times three (3) weeks cervical/lumbar/right knee:
Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: According to evidenced based guidelines, further acupuncture treatments after an initial trial are medically necessary based on documented functional improvement. The claimant had an initial acupuncture trial in 2010-2011 with at least 13 acupuncture visits with documentation of no improvement. There is no reasoning submitted as to why acupuncture

would benefit the claimant 3-4 years later if it did not help her in the past. Therefore 6 sessions of acupuncture are not medically necessary.