

Case Number:	CM15-0060549		
Date Assigned:	04/06/2015	Date of Injury:	09/06/2012
Decision Date:	05/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/30/2015

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 female sustained an industrial injury to the neck, back and bilateral shoulders on 9/6/12. Previous treatment included magnetic resonance imaging, physical therapy, aquatic therapy, massage, chiropractic therapy, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulator unit and medications. In a PR-2 dated 1/19/15, the injured worker was still having significant pain with more leg pain and pain radiating out across of the back. Current diagnoses included cervical spine stenosis. The physician noted that the injured worker's husband had left her. The physician noted that the injured worker would benefit from an in house service to help her with housekeeping for three hours day as well as physical therapy provided by a chiropractor. On 3/5/15 a request for authorization was submitted for physical therapy three times a week for six weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy three times a week for six weeks for the cervical spine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines physical medicine Page(s): 98-99.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on physical medicine states: Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices. (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007) Physical Medicine Guidelines Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks. Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks. Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. The goal of physical therapy is graduation to home therapy after a certain amount of recommended sessions. The request is in excess of these recommendations per the California MTUS. There is no explanation why the patient would not be moved to home therapy. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Cleaning Service once a week for six weeks: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Home Health Services.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines home health Page(s): 51.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guideline on home health services states: Home health services Recommended only for otherwise recommended medical treatment for patients who are Home bound, on a part-time or "intermittent" basis, generally up to no more than 35 hours per week. Medical treatment does not include homemaker services like

shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom when this is the only care needed. (CMS, 2004) Home health services are recommended for patient's who are home bound. The patient is not home bound nor does the services mentioned for home health in the documentation meet criteria as set forth above. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.