

Case Number:	CM15-0141956		
Date Assigned:	07/31/2015	Date of Injury:	02/26/2002
Decision Date:	08/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/21/2015

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 39 year old male who sustained a work related injury February 26, 2002, when a metal stamping machine crushed his right upper extremity. He is status post multiple reconstructive surgeries including failed nerve grafting. He continued to experience chronic daily persistent upper extremity pain, paresthasias and weakness especially in the ulnar nerve distribution. According to a most recent primary treating physician's progress report, dated June 2, 2015, the injured worker complains of right upper extremity pain, rated 5 out of 10, and numbness. He has a TENS unit and is getting therapy for his shoulder. He is requesting a refill of pain medication and complains that he doesn't like the generic brand of Lidoderm due to dizziness. He refuses urine and blood drug testing. Current medication included Ambien, Lyrica, Seroquel, Wellbutrin, Zoloft, Avinza, Lidoderm, and Oxycodone Hydrochloride. Upon examination flail right upper extremity. Assessment is documented as flail right upper extremity, following crush injury. Treatment plan included placement of Lidoderm patch on elbow with relief, and at issue, a request for authorization for physical therapy and an annual gym membership.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy 2 times a week for 6 weeks (12 sessions): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine.

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

Decision rationale: Time-limited care plan with specific defined goals, assessment of functional benefit with modification of ongoing treatment based upon the patient's progress in meeting those goals and the provider's continued monitoring of successful outcome is stressed by MTUS guidelines. 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. Submitted reports have no acute flare-up or specific physical limitations to support for physical/occupational therapy. The Chronic Pain Guidelines allow for visits of therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It is unclear how many PT sessions have been completed; however, the submitted reports have not identified clear specific functional improvement in ADLs, functional status, or decrease in medication and medical utilization nor have there been a change in neurological compromise or red-flag findings demonstrated from the formal physical therapy already rendered to support further treatment. The Physical therapy 2 times a week for 6 weeks (12 sessions) is not medically necessary or appropriate.

Annual 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 (ODG), Gym Memberships.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Exercise, Pages 46-47.

Decision rationale: It can be expected that the patient had been instructed in an independent home exercise program to supplement the formal physical therapy the patient had received and to continue with strengthening post discharge from PT. Although the MTUS Guidelines stress the importance of a home exercise program and recommend daily exercises, there is no evidence to support the medical necessity for access to the equipment available with a gym/pool membership versus resistive thera-bands to perform isometrics and eccentric exercises. It is recommended that the patient continue with the independent home exercise program as prescribed in physical therapy. The accumulated wisdom of the peer-reviewed, evidence-based literature is that musculoskeletal complaints are best managed with the eventual transfer to an independent home exercise program. Most pieces of gym equipment are open chain, i.e., the feet are not on the ground when the exercises are being performed. As such, training is not functional and important concomitant components, such as balance, recruitment of postural muscles, and coordination of muscular action, are missed. Again, this is adequately addressed with a home exercise program. Core stabilization training is best addressed with floor or standing exercises that make functional demands on the body, using body weight. These cannot be reproduced with

machine exercise units. There is no peer-reviewed, literature-based evidence that a gym membership or personal trainer is indicated nor is it superior to what can be conducted with a home exercise program. There is, in fact, considerable evidence-based literature that the less dependent an individual is on external services, supplies, appliances, or equipment, the more likely they are to develop an internal locus of control and self-efficacy mechanisms resulting in more appropriate knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. Submitted reports have not demonstrated indication or necessity beyond guidelines criteria. The Annual gym membership is not medically necessary or appropriate.