

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0050583		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/27/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/27/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/18/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/15/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/14/2013

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 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. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

This is a female patient with a date of injury of 8/27/12. A utilization review determination dated 10/15/13 recommends non-certification of physical therapy. A progress report dated 10/8/13 identifies that the patient is in her eighth month of pregnancy, which has lead to marked increase in her neck pain and intermittent upper extremity numbness and tingling. She was noted to be doing well with therapy and additional therapy was recommended until delivery.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Decision for Physical Therapy 2 x 6.:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for physical therapy 2 x 6, California MTUS cites that "patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels." Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of extensive prior PT sessions. The patient had a flare-up of symptoms attributed to her pregnancy, but no specific functional deficits were

noted, and there is no documentation as to why they could not be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the California MTUS supports only up to 10 PT sessions for this injury and, unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy 2 x 6 is not medically necessary.