

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0058629		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/16/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/16/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/27/2015

### 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 53 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/16/13. She reported initial complaints of cumulative trauma to cervical and lumbosacral spine. The injured worker was diagnosed as having musculotendinoligamentous sprain/strain L/S, disc bulging lumbosacral; radiculopathy lumbosacral, sacroiliac dysfunction; chronic pain and disability with delayed functional recovery; lumbar facet arthropathy; insomnia, cervical radiculitis syndrome. Treatment to date has included MRI lumbar spine (10/29/13); x-rays cervical, lumbar, left and right shoulder (10/15/14). Currently, the PR-2 notes dated 2/26/15, the injured worker complains of intermittent lower back, left hand and right hand pain. The injured worker also complains of left arm, left index finger, middle finger and the shoulder blade pain. The notes document an increased pain in the neck spreading to the head and down the left arm preventing her to sleep causing headaches. She is currently taking Ultram PRN, Lyrica at bedtime and Lyon's Special cream twice daily to affected area for pain. The injured worker has not tried any form of physical therapy. The provider's treatment plan included a request for both chiropractic therapy and physical therapy. Only the chiropractic therapy was approved per Utilization Review. 10/15/14 QME report notes that the patient tried PT twice a week for several months with no benefit.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Physical Therapy 3 x per week x 4 weeks: 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, Low Back, Shoulder, and Forearm, Wrist, and Hand 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.