

Case Number:	CM15-0083260		
Date Assigned:	05/05/2015	Date of Injury:	09/16/2014
Decision Date:	06/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/16/2015
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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive Medicine

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 47 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on September 16, 2014. She has reported injury to the chest, right shoulder and neck. Treatment has included rest, activity modification, elevation, splinting, medications, and physical therapy. Currently the injured worker continues to have neck pain radiating down the right arm. Physical examination noted restrictive range of motion secondary to pain in the cervical spine. She had pain with palpation in the paracervical and trapezial areas. She had decreased sensation in the right C6 distribution in the thumb and index finger. MRI demonstrated full thickness rotator cuff tear. The treatment request included additional physical therapy for the cervical spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Additional physical therapy for the cervical spine x 12: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173-175, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 65-194, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Neck and Upper Back, Physical Therapy, ODG Preface Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: MTUS refer to physical medicine guidelines for physical therapy and recommends as follows: "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine". Additionally, ACOEM guidelines advise against passive modalities by a therapist unless exercises are to be carried out at home by patient. ODG writes regarding neck and upper back physical therapy, "Recommended. Low stress aerobic activities and stretching exercises can be initiated at home and supported by a physical therapy provider, to avoid debilitation and further restriction of motion". ODG further quantifies its cervical recommendations with: Cervicalgia (neck pain); Cervical spondylosis, 9 visits over 8 weeks; Sprains and strains of neck, 10 visits over 8 weeks. Regarding physical therapy, ODG states "Patients should be formally assessed after a "six- visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted". At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. Medical records indicate this patient has attended at least 18 sessions of physical therapy. It should be noted that it appears this patient has another 6 sessions already approved. The requested number of sessions is in excess of guideline recommendations. The treating physician does not detail extenuating circumstances that would warrant exception to the guidelines. As such, the request for Additional physical therapy for the cervical spine x 12 is not medically necessary.