

Case Number:	CM14-0207923		
Date Assigned:	12/15/2014	Date of Injury:	12/31/1994
Decision Date:	02/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/12/2014

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 Occupational 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 68-year-old male with a 12/31/94 date of injury. At the time (11/17/14) of request for authorization for Functional Restoration Program Evaluation, there is documentation of subjective (bilateral knee pain) and objective (4/5 knee extension strength, edema over bilateral patellae, tenderness over the suprapatellar and infrapatellar bursa, and decreased Achilles reflex) findings, current diagnoses (degenerative joint disease of the knees, suprapatellar bursitis, and infrapatellar bursitis), and treatment to date (medications, physical therapy, and injections). Medical report identifies that the patient has a decrease of 50% in activities of daily living due to chronic pain and dysfunction. There is no documentation that there is an absence of other options likely to result in significant clinical improvement; the patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted; and the patient exhibits motivation to change.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Functional Restoration Program Evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Guidelines, page 92

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs) Page(s): 31-32.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation that previous methods of treating chronic pain have been unsuccessful and there is an absence of other options likely to result in significant clinical improvement; the patient has a significant loss of ability to function independently resulting from the chronic pain; the patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted; and the patient exhibits motivation to change, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of chronic pain program evaluation. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of degenerative joint disease of the knees, suprapatellar bursitis, and infrapatellar bursitis. In addition, given documentation that the patient has a decrease of 50% in activities of daily living due to chronic pain and dysfunction, there is documentation that previous methods of treating chronic pain have been unsuccessful; and the patient has a significant loss of ability to function independently resulting from the chronic pain. However, there is no documentation that there is an absence of other options likely to result in significant clinical improvement; the patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted; and the patient exhibits motivation to change. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Functional Restoration Program Evaluation is not medically necessary.