

Case Number:	CM14-0093882		
Date Assigned:	07/25/2014	Date of Injury:	11/16/2012
Decision Date:	08/28/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/27/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/20/2014

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, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California and Washington. 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 39-year-old female who reported an injury on 11/16/2012. The mechanism of injury was not provided within the medical records. The clinical note dated 06/26/2014 is hand written and hard to decipher. The clinical note indicated diagnoses of status post left knee anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction using Achilles tendon graft dated 11/07/2013. The injured worker reported left knee pain with stiffness and weakness. The injured worker reported she had completed 3 of 12 postop therapies because only 3 were certified. The injured worker reported her pain 9/10, mild, dull, burning, and numbness. On physical examination of the left knee, the injured worker ambulated with a limp. There was tenderness to palpation at the medial joint line. The injured worker had a positive Lachman. The injured worker's prior treatments included diagnostic imaging, surgery, and physical therapy. The treatment plan was for the injured worker to continue home exercises and continue medications. The provider submitted a request for gym membership with access to a pool. A request for authorization dated 05/15/2014 was submitted for gym membership with access to a pool; however, rationale was not provided for review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Gym membership with access to a pool: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Gym memberships.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Knee and Leg, Gym membership.

Decision rationale: The request for gym membership with access to a pool is not medically necessary. The Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) indicate a gym membership is not recommended as a medical prescription unless a home exercise program has not been effective and there is a need for equipment. In addition, treatment needs to be monitored and administered by medical professionals. While an individual exercise program is of course recommended, more elaborate personal care where outcomes are not monitored by a health professional, such as gym memberships or advanced home exercise equipment may not be covered under this guideline, although temporary transitional exercise programs may be appropriate for patients who need more supervision. There is lack of evidence of a home exercise program with periodic assessments, which have been modified and remained ineffective. In addition, the documentation submitted did not indicate a care plan including the professional who would be monitoring and administering medical care. Therefore, the request for gym membership with access to a pool is not medically necessary.