

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0158985		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/02/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/20/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/28/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/17/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/29/2014

### 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 Physical Medicine & 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 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 60-year-old female with a 4/20/07 date of injury. At the time (8/29/14) of request for authorization for home health evaluation: need for assistance and equipment, there is documentation of subjective (bilateral wrists/hands, low back, and bilateral knee pain) and objective (decreased bilateral wrist and lumbar range of motion, tenderness over the dorsal aspect of right hand, medial and lateral epicondyle, midline lumbosacral, and right medial and lateral knee joint line, and effusion and crepitus noted on the left knee) findings, current diagnoses (left medial epicondylitis, lumbar spine radiculopathy, bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, and right knee tricompartmental degenerative joint disease), and treatment to date (medications and physical therapy). There is no documentation that the patient requires recommended medical treatment (where homemaker services like shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom is not the only care needed) and the patient is homebound on a part-time or intermittent basis.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

#### **HOME HEALTH EVALUATION: NEED FOR ASSISTANCE AND EQUIPMENT:**

Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Home health services Page(s): 51.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation that the patient requires recommended medical treatment (where homemaker services like shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom is not the only care needed) and the patient is homebound on a part-time or intermittent basis, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of home health services. In addition, MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of no more than 35 hours per week. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of medial epicondylitis, lumbar spine radiculopathy, bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, and right knee tricompartmental degenerative joint disease. However, there is no documentation that the patient requires recommended medical treatment (where homemaker services like shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom is not the only care needed) and the patient is homebound on a part-time or intermittent basis. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence; the request for home health evaluation: need for assistance and equipment is not medically necessary.