

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0157219		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/30/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/28/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/24/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/12/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/25/2014

### 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 Preventive Medicine, has a subspecialty in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in Iowa. 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:

This is a 36 year old male patient with pain complains of the left knee. Diagnoses included left knee internal derangement. Previous treatments included: oral medication, physical therapy, acupuncture (unknown number of sessions or gains) and work modifications amongst others. As the patient continued symptomatic, a request for additional acupuncture (8-12 sessions) was made by the PTP. The requested care was denied on 09-12-14 by the UR reviewer. The reviewer rationale was "patient has had unknown prior acupuncture sessions...there is no detailed discussion of the efficacy of prior treatment...there is no comparison with prior exams..."

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Acupuncture 2-3x a week for 4 weeks:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

**Decision rationale:** The current mandated guidelines note that the amount of acupuncture to produce functional improvement is 3 to 6 treatments. The same guidelines read extension of acupuncture care could be supported for medical necessity "if functional improvement is documented as either a clinically significant improvement in activities of daily living or a

reduction in work restrictions and a reduction in the dependency on continued medical treatment." After an unknown number of prior acupuncture sessions (gains unreported), no evidence of sustained, significant, objective functional improvement (quantifiable response to treatment) obtained with previous acupuncture was offered to support the reasonableness and necessity of the additional acupuncture requested. In addition the request is for 8-12 sessions of acupuncture, number that exceeds significantly the guidelines without a medical reasoning to support such request. Therefore, the additional 8-12 sessions of acupuncture is not supported for medical necessity.