

Case Number:	CM14-0100406		
Date Assigned:	09/24/2014	Date of Injury:	09/20/2013
Decision Date:	12/31/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/28/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2014

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 Family Medicine and is licensed to practice in Colorado. 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:

22 year old male with date of injury 9/20/2013 continues care with the treating provider. Patient was injured in a fall from ceiling to floor with strain of cervical, thoracic, lumbar spine and left knee. Pain now includes neck, low back, mid back and left knee. Patient follows with a chiropractor. As of May 2014 office visit, treating provider requested additional PT and Acupuncture as well as more chiropractic care and MRI and EMG and electrodiagnostic studies. The treating provider requests 6 session's work hardening and 6 sessions work conditioning.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Work Hardening/Conditioning (6): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 125.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain Interventions and Treatments Page(s): 125.

Decision rationale: Per the Guidelines, Work conditioning/ Work hardening can be recommended, if good programs are available, and if criteria are met:(1) Must have industrial related musculoskeletal condition which limits function to the point that current job demands

cannot be met, when the job demands are NOT sedentary work. A Functional Capacity Evaluation may be needed to verify maximal effort.(2) Following an appropriate course of physical or occupational therapy with documented improvement, then plateau. However, to be candidate, should not be considered likely to benefit from further physical therapy or occupational therapy.(3) Not a surgical or other procedural candidate for improvement.(4) Must be recovered to the extent can participate in the program for a minimum of 4 hours a day for three to five days a week.(5) A specific return to work date and goal for duties, agreed upon by the employer & employee:(a) A documented specific job to return to with job demands that exceed abilities, OR(b) Documented on-the-job training(6) Must be assessed and determined by evaluation to have a good chance of succeeding in the program, psychologically as well as physically.(7) Should be no more than 2 year post-injury, as unlikely to benefit if have not returned to work by that time. (8) Should be able to complete the program in 4 weeks or less, consecutive.(9) Improvement / compliance should be documented within 1-2 weeks of starting the program, or participation in the program should be terminated.(10) If a previous program was completed, repeat participation not recommended.For the patient of concern, the records supplied do not indicate that patient meets criteria for the work hardening / work conditioning programs. The treating physician is still ordering physical therapy, and there is no indication that patient has "plateaued" with regard to therapy. The records do not include any documentation that patient has been assessed and deemed likely to succeed in the program. The records do not include information about any agreement with an employer to set goals for work.Per the records, patient is not in a position to benefit from Work hardening / Work conditioning at this time, so the request is not medically necessary.