

Case Number:	CM15-0225364		
Date Assigned:	11/23/2015	Date of Injury:	02/27/2015
Decision Date:	12/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/17/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 56 year old man sustained an industrial injury on 2-27-2015. Diagnoses include cervical musculoligamentous sprain-strain with radiculitis, rule out cervical spine discogenic disease, thoracic musculoligamentous sprain-strain, lumbosacral musculoligamentous sprain-strain, with radiculitis, rule out lumbosacral spine discogenic disease, and bilateral shoulder sprain-strain with tendinosis. Treatment has included oral medications and physical therapy. Physician notes dated 9-2-2015 show complaints of neck, back, and bilateral shoulder pain. The physical examination shows cervical spine tenderness with spasms and "decreased" range of motion, lumbar spine tenderness, "decreased" range of motion, bilateral shoulder tenderness with decreased sensation to the right hand, decreased motor strength to the right lower extremity, and decreased sensation to the right lower extremity. Recommendations include Tramadol, Trepadone, Fexmid, Flurbiprofen cream, lumbosacral brace, TENS unit, physical performance functional capacity evaluation, and physical therapy. Utilization Review denied a request for physical performance functional capacity evaluation on 10-19-2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical performance, functional capacity evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Integrated Treatment/Disability Duration Guidelines Pain (Chronic) Functional improvement measures Online Version (updated 10/09/2015).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) functional capacity evaluation.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address functional capacity evaluations. Per the ODG, functional capacity evaluations (FCE) are recommended prior to admission to work hardening programs, with preference for assessments tailored to a specific job. Not recommended as a routine use as part of occupational rehab or screening or generic assessments in which the question is whether someone can do any type of job. Consider FCE: 1. Case management is hampered by complex issues such as: a. Prior unsuccessful RTW attempts, b. Conflicting medical reporting on precaution and/or fitness for modified jobs, c. Injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities, 2. Timing is appropriate, a. Close or at MMI/all key medical reports secured, b. Additional/secondary conditions clarified. There is no indication in the provided documentation of prior failed return to work attempts or conflicting medical reports or injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities. Therefore, criteria have not been met as set forth by the ODG and the request is not medically necessary.