

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0138658		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/28/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/13/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/25/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/07/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/17/2015

### 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 56 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 1/13/2012. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having derangement of the left knee medial meniscus and left ankle sprain. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 6/30/2015, the injured worker complains of left knee pain with locking and swelling. Physical examination showed left knee tenderness. The treating physician is requesting 6 sessions of pool physical therapy for the left knee.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Physical therapy pool based for six sessions, in the treatment of the left knee:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 340. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg Chapter, Aquatic Therapy.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for aquatic therapy, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines state that aquatic therapy is recommended as an optional form of exercise therapy where available as an alternative to land-based physical therapy. They go on to state that it is specifically recommended whenever reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity. Guidelines go on to state that for the recommendation on the number of supervised visits, see physical therapy guidelines. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation indicating why the patient would require therapy in a reduced weight-bearing environment. Furthermore, there is no indication as to how many physical/aquatic therapy sessions the patient has undergone and what specific objective functional improvement has been obtained with the therapy sessions already provided. Additionally, there are no recent physical examination findings identifying any deficits which would be addressed with the requested aquatic therapy. Finally, there is no statement indicating whether the patient is performing a home exercise program on a regular basis, and whether or not that home exercise program has been modified if it has been determined to be ineffective. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested aquatic therapy is not medically necessary.