

Case Number:	CM15-0209382		
Date Assigned:	10/28/2015	Date of Injury:	12/15/2011
Decision Date:	12/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/23/2015

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: Psychologist

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This injured worker is a 64 year old female who reported an industrial injury on 12-15-2011. Her diagnoses, and or impressions, were noted to include: multiple musculoskeletal diagnoses, with surgery; major depressive disorder - single episode; generalized anxiety disorder; female hypoactive sexual disorder; and insomnia. No imaging studies were noted. Her treatments were noted to include: psychological services; cognitive behavioral group psychotherapy; relaxation training; medication management; and rest from work. The psychological progress notes of 9-14-2015 reported complaints which included: persistent pain and significant physical limitations with trouble ambulating; chronic sleep difficulties with nightmares, excessive worries and feelings of nervousness; that she was easily fatigued; that she felt discouraged, sad and pessimistic about her physical condition and lack of improvement; that she remained socially withdrawn; and that her intensity of symptoms had decreased with treatment. The objective findings were noted to include: that she appeared sad, tired, anxious, to be in pain, and pre-occupied with her physical condition; that she wore a back brace and ambulated with a cane; that she appeared to be in need of mental health treatment due to persistent symptoms of depression and anxiety; and that she attended groups and found it helpful with improving mood, motivation, and hope, and that her levels of depression and anxiety had decreased with treatment. The physician's requests for treatment were noted to include cognitive behavioral group psychotherapy, 1 session per week to help her cope with physical condition, levels of pain and emotional symptoms, for 6 weeks. The Request for Authorization, dated 10-2-2015, was noted for group medical psychotherapy 1 x a week x 6 weeks, total 6 sessions. The Utilization

Review of 10-15-2015 non-certified the request for outpatient group medical psychotherapy related to Major depressive disorder, 1 x a week for 6 weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 group psychotherapy once a week for 6 weeks as an outpatient: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Stress-Related Conditions 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Mental Illness and Stress Chapter: Cognitive therapy for depression.

Decision rationale: Based on the review of the medical records, the injured worker has been receiving psychological services from [REDACTED] and/or his colleagues since 8/7/13. The most recent requested progress report, dated 9/14/15, fails to offer information about the number of completed sessions to date, or at a minimum, those completed in 2015. Additionally, the report does not offer information about specific progress and improvements and instead, offers generic and generalized information. It also appears that the injured worker's diagnosis has not changed in 2 years despite having received consistent psychological treatment. Overall, the limited information within the various progress reports fails to substantiate the need for additional treatment. Therefore, the request for an additional 6 group psychotherapy sessions is not medically necessary.