

Case Number:	CM15-0015590		
Date Assigned:	04/16/2015	Date of Injury:	11/11/2003
Decision Date:	05/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/27/2015

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, Pain Management

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 41-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 11/11/03. Initial complaints and diagnoses are not available. Treatments to date include medication and an epidural injection. Diagnostic studies include nerve conduction studies and a MRI of the lumbar spine. Current complaints include back pain. Current diagnoses include left ankle fibular fracture, anterior talofibular ligament instability, right knee derivative injury, and lumbar spine radiculopathy. In a progress note dated 01/14/15, the treating provider reports the plan of care as a gym membership, a second epidural injection, physical therapy, and a consultation. Also included are Prilosec, Ultram, Fexmid, Hydrocodone, and Zofran. The requested treatments are a gym membership, physical therapy, and Zofran.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Gym membership: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back-Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute and Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 46-47 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Gym Memberships.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for gym membership, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that exercise is recommended. They go on to state that there is no sufficient evidence to support the recommendation of any particular exercise regimen over any other exercise regimen. ODG states the gym memberships are not recommended as a medical prescription unless a documented home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision has not been effective and there is a need for equipment. In addition, treatment needs to be monitored and administered by medical professionals. With unsupervised programs, there is no information flow back to the provider, so he or she can make changes in the prescription, and there may be a risk of further injury to the patient. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed a home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision. Additionally, there is no indication that the patient has been trained on the use of gym equipment, or that the physician is overseeing the gym exercise program. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested gym membership is not medically necessary.

8 Physical Therapy visits: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back-Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute and Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 98-99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Ankle/Foot, Knee, and Low Back Chapters, Physical Medicine.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course (10 sessions) of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with any previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription for Zofran: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, Antiemetics.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for ondansetron (Zofran), California MTUS guidelines do not contain criteria regarding the use of antiemetic medication. ODG states that antiemetics are not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Guidelines go on to recommend that ondansetron is approved for postoperative use, nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy, and acute use for gastroenteritis. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has nausea as a result of any of these diagnoses. Additionally, there is no indication of efficacy from any prior use. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested ondansetron (Zofran) is not medically necessary.