

Case Number:	CM14-0200790		
Date Assigned:	12/11/2014	Date of Injury:	08/07/2012
Decision Date:	02/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/04/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/01/2014

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 licensed in Chiropractor (DC) 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 49 year old female who reported neck pain from injury sustained on 08/07/12. Mechanism of injury was not documented in the provided medical records. Patient is diagnosed with post traumatic cephalgia; chronic cervical spine sprain/strain; thoracic spine sprain/strain. Patient has been treated with medication, physical therapy, acupuncture, and chiropractic. Per medical notes dated 07/09/14, patient complains of neck pain associated with stiffness, worsened by side to side movement. Examination revealed tenderness over the paracervical musculature without spasms. Per medical notes dated 09/03/14, patient feels her condition has remained the same to date. She has received 17 sessions of physiotherapy, 17 sessions of chiropractic and 3 sessions of acupuncture. Patient complains of headaches, neck pain and upper back pain. Provider requested additional 8 acupuncture visits and 4 chiropractic visits which were non-certified by the utilization review. Therefore, the Utilization Review decision was appealed for an Independent Medical Review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

8 Acupuncture Visits for Cervical Spine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS- Section 9792.24.1 Acupuncture Medical treatment Guidelines page 8-9, "Acupuncture is used as an option when pain medication is reduced and not tolerated, it may be used as an adjunct to physical rehabilitation and/or surgical intervention to hasten functional recovery". "Time to produce function improvement: 1) 3-6 treatments. 2) Frequency: 1-3 times per week. 3) Optimum duration: 1-2 months. Acupuncture treatments may be extended if functional improvement is documented". Patient has had prior acupuncture treatment. Provider requested additional 8 acupuncture treatments which were non-certified by the utilization review. There is lack of evidence that prior acupuncture care was of any functional benefit. There is no assessment in the provided medical records of functional efficacy with prior acupuncture visits. Medical reports reveal little evidence of significant changes or improvement in findings, revealing a patient who has not achieved significant objective functional improvement to warrant additional treatment. Additional visits may be rendered if the patient has documented objective functional improvement. Per MTUS guidelines, Functional improvement means either a clinically significant improvement in activities of daily living or a reduction in work restrictions as measured during the history and physical exam or decrease in medication intake. Per review of evidence and guidelines, 8 acupuncture treatments are not medically necessary.

4 Chiropractic Visits for Cervical Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual Therapy and Manipulations.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual Therapy and Manipulation Page(s): 58-59.

Decision rationale: Patient has had prior chiropractic treatments; however, clinical notes fail to document any functional improvement with prior care. Provider requested additional 4 chiropractic sessions for cervical spine. Medical reports reveal little evidence of significant changes or improvement in findings, revealing a patient who has not achieved significant objective functional improvement to warrant additional treatment. Per guidelines, functional improvement means either a clinically significant improvement in activities of daily living or a reduction in work restrictions as measured during the history and physical exam. Requested visits exceed the quantity supported by cited guidelines. Per review of evidence and guidelines, 4 Chiropractic visits are not medically necessary.