

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0088074		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/23/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/30/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/27/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/14/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/11/2014

### 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 licensed in Chiropractic, has a subspecialty in Pediatric Chiropractic 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 injured worker is a 37 year old individual with an original date of injury of 9/30/13. The mechanism of injury occurred when the patient lifted a propane tank. The diagnoses include right sacroiliitis. The patient has received 13 sessions of physical therapy, but this was not helpful in relieving the patient's symptoms. The injured worker has undergone 9 approved chiropractic treatments. There is no documented objective, functional improvement from these prior treatments. The disputed issue is a request for 8 additional chiropractic treatments for the low back, with sessions 2 times a week for 4 weeks. An earlier Medical Review made an adverse determination regarding this request. The rationale for this adverse determination was that the request does not meet medical guidelines of the California MTUS.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Low Back Chiropractic Care 2 x per Week x 4 Weeks:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Lumbar - Chiropractic, Integrated Treatment/Disability Duration Guidelines; Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual therapy and manipulation Page(s): 58-60.

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS Guidelines does recommend Chiropractic treatment, in general, for chronic pain, with a trial of 6 visits over 2 weeks, and up to a total of 18 visits over 6-8 weeks, with evidence of objective, functional improvement. Recurrences or flare-ups need to reevaluate treatment success, if RTW achieved then 1-2 visits every 4-6 months. There is no documented objective, functional improvement from the treatments already received. The request for an additional 8 chiropractic treatments for the low back is not medically necessary.