

Case Number:	CM15-0087688		
Date Assigned:	05/11/2015	Date of Injury:	09/06/2013
Decision Date:	06/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/07/2015

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 55 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/6/2013. Diagnoses have included bilateral shoulder tendinopathies, left shoulder sprain/strain, cervical sprain/strain, lower back pain with sprain/strain injury and bilateral knee pain with sprain/strain injuries. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medication. According to the progress report dated 4/6/2015, the injured worker complained of chronic back pain, muscle spasms, bilateral knee pain, shoulder pain and neck pain. He rated his pain as 8/10, at best as 4/10 with medications and 10/10 without medications. He remained off work. He was currently in physical therapy for his upper extremity complaints which he stated was helpful. He asked for physical therapy for his knees. Exam of the neck revealed limited range of motion. Exam of the back revealed limited range of motion. He ambulated with a limp. Right shoulder exam revealed tenderness over the subacromion; impingement sign was positive. Left shoulder exam revealed limited range of motion with mild crepitus and positive impingement sign. Exam of the both knees revealed painful patellar compressions and peripatellar swelling. There was also crepitus on passive range of motion in both knees. The physical therapy discharge summary dated 4/9/2015 documents that the injured worker reported decreased pain and improved function in the right shoulder. He was to continue a home exercise program. Authorization was requested for 12 additional physical therapy visits regarding his knee complaints.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

12 additional physical therapy visits: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, pages 98-99.

Decision rationale: 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 functional 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. It appears the employee has received significant therapy sessions without demonstrated evidence of functional improvement to allow for additional therapy treatments. There is no report of acute flare-up, new injuries, or change in symptom or clinical findings to support for formal PT in a patient that has been instructed on a home exercise program for this chronic injury. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support further physical therapy when prior treatment rendered has not resulted in any functional benefit. The 12 additional physical therapy visits is not medically necessary and appropriate.