

Case Number:	CM15-0163509		
Date Assigned:	09/11/2015	Date of Injury:	04/30/2012
Decision Date:	10/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/29/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/20/2015

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 71-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on April 30, 2012, incurring left knee injuries. He was diagnosed with tricompartmental osteoarthritis, internal derangement of the medial meniscus, lower leg degenerative joint disease and patellofemoral syndrome. Treatment included physical therapy, anti-inflammatory drugs, pain medications, knee bracing, and activity restrictions. The injured worker noted the medications helped him function with his activities of daily living. Currently, the injured worker complained of persistent left knee pain. He rated his pain 7 on a pain scale from 0 to 10. He noted knee bracing and meds helped with the pain. He noted tenderness and instability on range of motion. There was crepitus noted on movement. He was diagnosed with acute on chronic left knee pain. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization on July 29, 2015, included physical therapy for six sessions. On July 22, 2015, utilization review denied the authorization for physical therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy for six (6) sessions: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Physical Medicine.

Decision rationale: Physical 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. However, there is no clear measurable evidence of progress with the PT treatment already rendered including milestones of increased ROM, strength, and functional capacity. Review of submitted physician reports show no evidence of functional benefit, unchanged chronic symptom complaints, clinical findings, and functional status. There is no evidence documenting functional baseline with clear goals to be reached and the patient striving to reach those goals. The Chronic Pain Guidelines allow for visits of physical therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It appears the employee has received significant therapy sessions without demonstrated evidence of functional improvement to allow for additional therapy treatments. There is no report of acute flare-up, new injuries, or change in symptom or clinical findings to support for formal PT in a patient that has been instructed on a home exercise program for this chronic injury. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support further physical therapy when prior treatment rendered has not resulted in any functional benefit. The Physical Therapy for six (6) sessions is not medically necessary and appropriate.