

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0162448 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 08/28/2015 | Date of Injury: | 06/07/2014 |
| Decision Date: | 09/30/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 07/31/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 08/18/2015 |

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 35 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 7, 2014. The initial diagnosis and symptoms experienced, by the injured worker, were not included in the documentation. Treatment to date has included MRI, physical therapy, subacromial cortisone injection, surgery and home exercise program. Currently, the injured worker complains of decreased left shoulder range of motion resulting in decreased strength. The injured worker is currently diagnosed with a superior glenoid labrum lesion and post SLAP repair. A progress note dated January 23, 2015, states the injured worker did not experience therapeutic efficacy from physical therapy. A progress note dated January 29, 2015, states the injured worker experienced significant temporary relief from the subacromial cortisone injection. The note also states that physical therapy aggravated his symptoms. A progress note dated June 18, 2015, states the injured worker continues to experience a decreased range of motion in the left shoulder. A progress note dated July 16, 2015, states the injured worker is not experiencing continued progress with the home exercise program. Work conditioning to the left shoulder (12 sessions) is requested to improve range of motion and increase strength.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Work Conditioning to the Left Shoulder Qty 12: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines work hardening Page(s): 125-126.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on work hardening states: Recommended as an option, depending on the availability of quality programs. Criteria for admission to a Work Hardening Program: (1) Work related musculoskeletal condition with functional limitations precluding ability to safely achieve current job demands, which are in the medium or higher demand level (i.e., not clerical/sedentary work). An FCE may be required showing consistent results with maximal effort, demonstrating capacities below an employer verified physical demands analysis (PDA). (2) After treatment with an adequate trial of physical or occupational therapy with improvement followed by plateau, but not likely to benefit from continued physical or occupational therapy, or general conditioning. (3) Not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted to improve function. (4) Physical and medical recovery sufficient to allow for progressive reactivation and participation for a minimum of 4 hours a day for three to five days a week. (5) A defined return to work goal agreed to by the employer & employee: (a) A documented specific job to return to with job demands that exceed abilities, OR (b) Documented on-the-job training. (6) The worker must be able to benefit from the program (functional and psychological limitations that are likely to improve with the program). Approval of these programs should require a screening process that includes file review, interview and testing to determine likelihood of success in the program. (7) The worker must be no more than 2 years past date of injury. Workers that have not returned to work by two years post injury may not benefit. (8) Program timelines: Work Hardening Programs should be completed in 4 weeks consecutively or less. (9) Treatment is not supported for longer than 1-2 weeks without evidence of patient compliance and demonstrated significant gains as documented by subjective and objective gains and measurable improvement in functional abilities. (10) Upon completion of a rehabilitation program (e.g. work hardening, work conditioning, outpatient medical rehabilitation) neither re-enrollment in nor repetition of the same or similar rehabilitation program is medically warranted for the same condition or injury. Per the guidelines above, this type of program is not recommended for more than 1-2 weeks without evidence of significant gains. The request is for 12 sessions. Therefore, criteria have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.