

Case Number:	CM13-0060714		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2013	Date of Injury:	03/03/2009
Decision Date:	05/08/2014	UR Denial Date:	11/22/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/03/2013

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 Board Certified in Occupational Medicine 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. 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:

The patient is a 62 year-old male who was injured on 03/03/2009 he slipped and fell injuring the right knee, low back and left hip. Prior treatment history has included physical therapy, pool therapy, TENS unit, exercise and epidural injections. He has had bilateral radiofrequency of his facet and sacroiliac joints. His medications include: 1. Trazadone 50 mg 2. Butrans patch 20 mcg 3. Zolpidem 10 mg 4. Celebrex 200 mg Progress note dated 09/10/2013 documented the patient to have complaints of mainly low back pain, although he had some right sided knee pain as well. . Objective findings on exam were unchanged. It was noted that patient has gained some weight because he cannot walk much; he uses a cane and then still walks with a huge limp. It is important to improve him so that we can also get him exercise and get some weight off of him. Progress noted dated 10/28/2013 documented the patient stating he has tried the Terocin patches and the Monarch cream. The patient has otherwise noticed that he has very limited function that inhibits him from doing activities of daily living; for instance, he can only walk for 15 minutes and then has to sit down. Considering that he is only 62, that is a very short distance. He used to fish. He can only do that for one or two casts. The patient otherwise uses a cane. He did not tolerate Nucynta as a medication. Objective findings are unchanged. Treatment Modalities: I think at this time it would be safer and more economical for him to use a stationary bicycle.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

STATIONARY BICYCLE PURCHASE (LUMBAR): Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation [HTTP://WWW.SPINE-HEALTH.COM/WELLNESS/EXERCISE/EXERCISE-BIKES-A-LOW-STRESS-WORK-OUT](http://www.spine-health.com/wellness/exercise/exercise-bikes-a-low-stress-work-out)

Decision rationale: CA MTUS and ODG do not specifically discuss the issue in dispute and hence other evidence based guidelines have been used. As per the guidelines, "exercise biking provides a gentle, low-impact workout without putting too much stress on the spine." A provider note dated 09/10/2013 indicates that the patient has gained some weight because he cannot walk much, uses a cane and still walks with a huge limp. The provider recommended stationary bike in order to get him exercise to reduce his weight. A note dated 10/28/13 indicates he has limited function, has difficulties performing ADLs and only able to walk 15 minutes. The provider notes that he has "considered all possible means of exercise....I think it would be safer and more economical for him to use his stationary bike." Based on the guidelines and medical records provided, the request appears to be medically necessary