

Case Number:	CM15-0103816		
Date Assigned:	06/08/2015	Date of Injury:	02/20/2015
Decision Date:	08/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/29/2015

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 50-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 2-20-2015. He reported a slip and injury to his left knee and left hip. Diagnoses include left knee severe osteoarthritis with traumatic flare, left hip severe bone on bone osteoarthritis with traumatic flare, status post right total hip arthroplasty, and diabetes. Treatments to date include topical anti-inflammatory cream, crutches, left knee injection, and two physical therapy sessions. Currently, he complained of left knee and hip pain. The provider indicated that due to having diabetes and inability to take oral anti-inflammatory medication, that the topical anti-inflammatory was helpful. There was decreased pain with a prior therapeutic injection and two physical therapy sessions. On 5-22-15, the physical examination documented the left knee had decreased range of motion with tenderness and crepitation. The treating diagnoses included left knee severe osteoarthritis with traumatic flare, left hip severe bone on bone osteoarthritis with traumatic flare, status post right total hip arthroplasty. The plan of care included six physical therapy sessions to treat the left knee and twelve physical therapy sessions for the left hip.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

6 physical therapy sessions for the left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, pages 98-99.

Decision rationale: Request for therapy was modified per review. Physical therapy is considered medically necessary when the services require the judgment, knowledge, and skills of a qualified physical therapist due to the complexity and sophistication of the therapy and the physical condition of the patient. However, there is no clear measurable evidence of progress with the PT treatment already rendered including milestones of increased ROM, strength, and functional capacity. Review of submitted physician reports show no evidence of functional benefit, unchanged symptom complaints, clinical findings, and functional status. There is no evidence documenting functional baseline with clear goals to be reached and the patient striving to reach those goals. The Guidelines allow for visits of physical therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It appears the employee has received previous therapy sessions without demonstrated evidence of functional improvement to allow for additional therapy treatments. There is no report of acute flare-up, new injuries, or change in symptom or clinical findings to support for formal PT. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support further physical therapy when prior treatment rendered has not resulted in any functional benefit. The 6 physical therapy sessions for the left knee is not medically necessary and appropriate.

8 physical therapy sessions for the left hip: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, pages 98-99.

Decision rationale: Request for therapy was modified per review. Physical therapy is considered medically necessary when the services require the judgment, knowledge, and skills of a qualified physical therapist due to the complexity and sophistication of the therapy and the physical condition of the patient. However, there is no clear measurable evidence of progress with the PT treatment already rendered including milestones of increased ROM, strength, and functional capacity. Review of submitted physician reports show no evidence of functional benefit, unchanged symptom complaints, clinical findings, and functional status. There is no evidence documenting functional baseline with clear goals to be reached and the patient striving to reach those goals. The Guidelines allow for visits of physical therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It appears the employee has received previous therapy sessions without demonstrated evidence of functional improvement to allow for additional therapy treatments. There is no report of acute flare-up, new injuries, or change in symptom or clinical findings to support for formal PT. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support further physical therapy when prior treatment rendered has not resulted in any functional benefit. The 8 physical therapy sessions for the left hip is not medically necessary and appropriate.