

Case Number:	CM15-0082711		
Date Assigned:	05/05/2015	Date of Injury:	08/24/2009
Decision Date:	06/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/30/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 70 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/24/09. She reported back pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having chronic pain syndrome, dysthymic disorder, muscle pain, numbness, lumbar spondylosis, lumbar degenerative disc disease and low back pain. Treatment to date has included SI joint injections, physical therapy, trigger point injections, oral medications and psych treatments. Currently, the injured worker complains of burning, aching pain in low back, buttocks and legs, right greater than left. She rates the pain 4/10 with medications and 7/10 without medications; it is worsened with prolonged activity and improved with changing positions, injections and medications. The injured worker noted gabapentin helps with neuropathic pain, numbness, and naproxen helps with pain and inflammation. It is also noted she has failed physical therapy treatment. Physical exam noted tenderness to sacroiliac joints bilaterally, trigger point tenderness over right L5-S1 paraspinous muscle and right gluteus and increased pain with range of motion. A request for authorization was submitted for aquatic therapy, prescriptions for Anaprox, Neurontin and Flexeril and cognitive behavioral therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Aquatic therapy for the lumbar spine 6 sessions: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 22, 41-42, 67.

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

Decision rationale: Aquatic Therapy does not seem appropriate, as the patient has received land-based Physical therapy. There is no records indicating intolerance of treatment, incapable of making same gains with land-based program nor is there any medical diagnosis or indication to require Aqua therapy at this time. The patient is not status-post recent lumbar or knee surgery nor is there diagnosis of morbid obesity requiring gentle aquatic rehabilitation with passive modalities and should have the knowledge to continue with functional improvement with a Home exercise program. The patient has completed formal sessions of PT and there is nothing submitted to indicate functional improvement from treatment already rendered. There is no report of new acute injuries that would require a change in the functional restoration program. There is no report of acute flare-up and the patient has been instructed on a home exercise program for this injury. Per Guidelines, physical therapy is considered medically necessary when the services require the judgment, knowledge, and skills of a qualified physical therapist due to the complexity and sophistication of the therapy and the physical condition of the patient. However, there is no clear measurable evidence of progress with the PT treatment already rendered including milestones of increased ROM, strength, and functional capacity. Review of submitted physician reports show no evidence of functional benefit, unchanged chronic symptom complaints, clinical findings, and work status. There is no evidence documenting functional baseline with clear goals to be reached and the patient striving to reach those goals. The Chronic Pain Guidelines allow for visits of physical therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support for the pool therapy. The Aquatic therapy for the lumbar spine 6 sessions is not medically necessary and appropriate.