

Case Number:	CM15-0105880		
Date Assigned:	06/10/2015	Date of Injury:	10/24/2013
Decision Date:	07/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/02/2015

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 28 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 10/24/2013. Treatment provided to date has included: physical therapy, acupuncture, medications, and conservative therapies/care. Diagnostic testing was not mentioned. There were no noted previous injuries or dates of injury, and no noted comorbidities. On 05/08/2015, physician progress report noted complaints of low back pain. Pain is rated as 5 (0-10) without pain medication and described as constant, throbbing, stabbing and occasional numbness when intense. Additional issues included decreased right foot radiculopathy since discontinuing acupuncture, sleep disturbances, loss of appetite, and depression. Current medications include naproxen, Norco, tramadol, cyclobenzaprine, and omeprazole. Other current treatments include electrical stimulation, home exercises/stretching, and heat therapy. The physical exam revealed spasms and tenderness in the mid back and lower back. The provider noted diagnoses of lumbosacral/joint/ligament strain/sprain, lumbago/lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy, closed dislocation of the sacrum, and right-sided lumbosacral or thoracic neuritis or radiculitis. Plan of care includes a physical performance test, Norco for weaning, Baclofen, and consultation for injections. The injured worker's work status temporarily totally disabled. Requested treatments include a physical performance test and Norco (authorized).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical performance test: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Practice Guidelines, Chapter 7: Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 137-138.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chapter 7, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page(s) 137-138.

Decision rationale: The patient has received a significant amount of conservative treatments without sustained long-term benefit. The patient continues to treat for ongoing significant symptoms with further plan for care without any work status changed, remaining temporarily totally disabled. It appears the patient has not reached maximal medical improvement and continues to treat for chronic pain symptoms. Current review of the submitted medical reports has not adequately demonstrated the indication to support for the request for Functional Capacity Evaluation as the patient continues to actively treat. Per the ACOEM Treatment Guidelines on the Chapter for Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations regarding Functional Capacity Evaluation, there is little scientific evidence confirming FCEs ability to predict an individual's actual work capacity as behaviors and performances are influenced by multiple nonmedical factors which would not determine the true indicators of the individual's capability or restrictions. The Physical performance test is not medically necessary and appropriate.