

Case Number:	CM15-0029260		
Date Assigned:	02/23/2015	Date of Injury:	11/20/1976
Decision Date:	04/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/26/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/17/2015

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, Pain Management

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 65 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 11/20/1976. Current diagnoses include right knee medial meniscus tear and degenerative joint disease. Previous treatments included medication management, chiropractic treatments and physical therapy. Report dated 01/15/2015 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included knee pain. Physical examination was not included. The physician noted that the injured worker had bursitis. Physical therapy progress notes support that the injured worker has previously completed 12 visits of physical therapy. MRI of the right knee dated 12/27/2014 was included in the documentation submitted. Utilization review performed on 01/26/2015 non-certified a prescription for 12 physical therapy sessions for the right knee to include phonophoresis, based on the clinical information submitted does not support medical necessity. The reviewer referenced the California MTUS, ACOEM, and Official Disability Guidelines in making this decision.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

12 physical therapy sessions for the right knee to include phonophoresis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 337-338. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Knee & Leg Chapter, Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for additional physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. ODG recommends 9 therapy visits for meniscus injuries. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the request exceeds the amount of PT recommended by ODG. In light of the above issues, the currently requested additional physical therapy is not medically necessary.