

Case Number:	CM15-0021186		
Date Assigned:	02/11/2015	Date of Injury:	07/22/1980
Decision Date:	03/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/03/2015

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 7/22/1980. He has reported bilateral knee pain after repetitively getting in and out of cars, running and falling. The diagnoses have included diabetes mellitus, chronic pain state, obesity, tibial stress syndrome, plantar fasciitis, diabetic neuropathy, and painful feet and legs. Treatment to date has included medications, diagnostics, conservative measures and surgery. Currently, the injured worker complains of periodic episodes of orthostatic dizziness that is fleeting. He is eating on a regular basis and essentially only needs the insulin in the evening as needed according to the home blood sugar monitoring. He is tolerating the medications well and trying to remain as active as possible. The pain levels fluctuate quite a bit and it is still hard to sleep at times due to the pain, which causes daytime fatigue. Physical exam revealed weight 238 pounds and blood pressure 128/77. The blood sugars ranged from 122-138. The lung sounds were clear and heart rate was regular. The clothes continue to loosen and he has been losing weight. Work status was retired. On 1/12/15 Utilization Review non-certified a request for 1 Year Coverage for Gym Membership Between 1/7/2015 and 1/7/2016, noting that gym memberships, health clubs, swimming pools, athletic clubs, etc., would not be considered medical treatment and therefore not covered under the guidelines. The Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) was cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Year Coverage for Gym Membership Between 1/7/2015 and 1/7/2016: 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), Low Back, Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)

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

Decision rationale: 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 therabands 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. Pool Therapy does not seem appropriate as the patient has received land-based Physical therapy. There is no records indicating intolerance of treatment, incapable of making same gains with land-based program nor is there any medical diagnosis or indication to require Aqua therapy at this time. The patient is not status-post recent lumbar or knee surgery nor is there diagnosis of morbid obesity requiring gentle aquatic rehabilitation with passive modalities. The patient has completed formal sessions of PT and there is nothing submitted to indicate functional improvement from treatment already rendered. There is no report of new acute injuries that would require a change in the functional restoration program. There is no report of acute flare-up and the patient has been instructed on a home exercise program for this injury. The 1 Year Coverage for Gym Membership Between 1/7/2015 and 1/7/2016 is not medically necessary and appropriate.