

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0058204		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/20/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/04/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/02/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/26/2015

### 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: Massachusetts

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 32 year old female who sustained a work related injury May 20, 2013. According to a primary treating physician's progress report dated February 2, 2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of neck pain, 8/10, bilateral shoulder pain, 8/10, and left hand pain, 7/10. Objective findings are documented as full range of motion of the left elbow and shoulder, with some pain and discomfort, and no new motor or sensory deficit. Diagnosis documented as left elbow contusion. Treatment plan included medications; Norco and Motrin and a request for authorization for physical therapy 2 x 4 weeks.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Eight (8) physical therapy sessions:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) (1) Chronic pain, Physical medicine treatment. (2) Preface, Physical Therapy Guidelines.

**Decision rationale:** The claimant is nearly 3 years status post work-related injury and continues to be treated for chronic neck, shoulder, and left hand pain. Treatments have included recent physical therapy with a home exercise program in September 2014. In terms of physical therapy treatment for chronic pain, guidelines recommend a six visit clinical trial with a formal reassessment prior to continuing therapy. In this case, the claimant has recently had physical therapy. Patients are expected to continue active therapies at home. Ongoing compliance with a home exercise program would be expected and would not require continued skilled physical therapy oversight. Providing additional skilled physical therapy services would not reflect a fading of treatment frequency and would promote dependence on therapy provided treatments. The claimant has no other identified impairment that would preclude performing such a program. The additional physical therapy was not medically necessary.