

Case Number:	CM15-0053041		
Date Assigned:	03/26/2015	Date of Injury:	09/08/2014
Decision Date:	05/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/20/2015

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 52 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on September 8, 2014. The injured worker had reported injuries to the neck, low back, left ankle and right wrist related to a motor vehicle accident. The diagnoses have included back pain, headaches, left ankle sprain and cervical, thoracic and lumbar sprain/strain. Treatment to date has included medications, radiological studies and physical therapy. Current documentation dated February 25, 2015 notes that the injured worker reported constant sharp, stabbing and shooting pain in the neck, low back right wrist and left ankle. The injured worker was noted to be frustrated with the pain and felt depressed and had difficulty sleeping. No Physical examination was noted. The treating physician's plan of care included a request for physical therapy to the left ankle and neck # 6 and a back brace for driving.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy for Left Ankle/Neck 6 sessions: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 98-99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Neck and Ankle Chapters, Physical Medicine.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course (10 sessions) 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. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with any 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 the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy is not medically necessary.

DME; Back Brace times 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for back brace, ACOEM guidelines state that lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. Within the documentation available for review, the patient is well beyond the acute stage of injury and there is no documentation of a pending/recent spine surgery, spinal instability, compression fracture, or another clear rationale for a brace in the management of this patient's chronic injury. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested back brace is not medically necessary.