

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0060267		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/09/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/21/2000
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/30/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/04/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/01/2014

### 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 and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain 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:

This is a patient with a date of injury of June 21, 2000. A utilization review determination dated April 4, 2014 recommends noncertification of a one-year gym membership. A report dated December 4, 2013 states that the patient underwent left knee arthroplasty. A progress report dated March 21, 2014 identifies subjective complaints indicating that the patient has completed 30 sessions of postoperative physical therapy is making progressive gains with motion. She is having a hard time maintaining gains from one session to another and can walk 45 minutes without pain but lacks full extension and flexion. Physical examination findings indicate that the patient has gained 30 of motion following manipulation but still has limited range of motion. The diagnoses include joint replacement of the knee and osteoarthritis of the left leg. The treatment plan recommends a gym membership to continue exercise at a gym.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**1 Year Gym Membership:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official disability guidelines ,knee ,Gym membership

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 46-47. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Gym Memberships

**Decision rationale:** Regarding request for gym membership, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that exercise is recommended. They go on to state that there is no sufficient evidence to support the recommendation of any particular exercise regimen over any other exercise regimen. ODG states the gym memberships are not recommended as a medical prescription unless a documented home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision has not been effective and there is a need for equipment. Plus, treatment needs to be monitored and administered by medical professionals. With unsupervised programs there is no information flow back to the provider, so he or she can make changes in the prescription, and there may be a risk of further injury to the patient. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed a home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision. Additionally, there is no indication that the patient has been trained on the use of gym equipment, or that the physician is overseeing the gym exercise program. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested gym membership is not medically necessary.