

Case Number:	CM15-0168879		
Date Assigned:	09/14/2015	Date of Injury:	01/22/2015
Decision Date:	10/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/27/2015

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

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 57-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on January 22, 2015, incurring shoulder, left leg, upper and lower back injuries. He was diagnosed with left fractured leg, lumbago, shoulder sprain, concussion, and multiple contusions. Treatment included physical therapy and home exercise program, pain medications, sleep aides, anti-inflammatory drugs and activity restrictions with modifications. Currently, the injured worker complained of persistent cervical and lumbar spine pain with restricted range of motion. He rated his pain a 9 out of 10 on a pain scale. He noted his activities of daily living such as cooking, housework, standing, walking and sitting are improved with medications. He complained of frequent muscle spasms, muscle weakness, loss of strength, headaches and memory loss. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization on August 27, 2015, included six physical therapy visits for the cervical spine and six visits of physical therapy for the lumbar spine. On August 29, 2015, utilization review denied physical therapy for the cervical spine and lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Extension physical therapy cervical 6 visits: 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: 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 9-10 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. Submitted reports have also not adequately demonstrated the indication to support for excessive quantity of PT sessions without extenuating circumstances established beyond the guidelines. The Extension physical therapy cervical 6 visits is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Extension physical therapy lumbar 6 visits: 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 Extension physical therapy lumbar 6 visits is not medically necessary and appropriate.