

Case Number:	CM15-0087086		
Date Assigned:	05/11/2015	Date of Injury:	09/21/2011
Decision Date:	06/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/06/2015

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:

This 61 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 9/21/11. He subsequently reported low back pain. Diagnoses include lumbago, spondylosis, lumbar disc degeneration and radiculitis. Treatments to date include MRI testing, physical therapy, injections and prescription pain medications. The injured worker continues to experience low back pain. On examination, the injured worker walks with a limp, has tenderness to palpation over the paraspinous and sacroiliac joint and restrictions in active and passive ranges of motion . A request for Continued Treatment Follow Up visit was made by the treating physician.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Continued Treatment Follow Up With [REDACTED]: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disabilities Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): Chapter 7- Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

Decision rationale: Guidelines state office visits and follow-ups are determined to be medically necessary and play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and treatment based on the patient's concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability along with monitoring of medications including opiates. Determination of necessity requires individualized case review and assessment with focus on return to function of the injured worker. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated acute symptoms or red flag conditions and clinical findings to allow for continued arbitrary follow-up intervention and care and future care with multiple visits cannot be predetermined as assessment should be made according to presentation and clinical appropriateness. The patient continues to treat for chronic symptoms without any acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration to predict future outcome. The Continued Treatment Follow Up With [REDACTED] is not medically necessary and appropriate.