MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0088512		
Date Assigned:	05/12/2015	Date of Injury:	06/10/2014
Decision Date:	06/12/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/30/2015
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:

This 22 year old female sustained an industrial injury to the back on 6/10/14. Magnetic resonance imaging lumbar spine (6/11/14) showed a moderate sized right L4-5 disc protrusion with severe central canal stenosis and probable impingement of sacral nerve roots. The injured worker underwent L4-5 and L5-S1 discectomy with L5-S1 laminectomy on 6/12/14. Previous treatment included magnetic resonance imaging, physical therapy, massage, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulator unit and medications. Documentation did not disclose the amount of previous physical therapy or whether functional improvement had occurred. The injured worker had recently been treated for a urinary tract infection with antibiotics, urodynamic studies and Kegel exercises. In a progress note dated 3/3/15, the injured worker complained of low back pain rated 7/10 on the visual analog scale associated with intermittent right buttock pain as well as numbness, pins and needles in the perineal area. Physical exam was remarkable for lumbar spine with decreased and painful range of motion and normal lower extremity range of motion. Current diagnoses included lumbar spine stenosis without claudication, lumbar spine radiculitis and cauda equina syndrome. The treatment plan included additional physical therapy to help the injured worker achieve her next goal of increasing range of motion, increasing ability to perform more daily functions at home and potentially going back to work sooner, follow-up with urology and a urinalysis.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy QTY: 8. 00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines Page(s): 98-99.

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 Physical therapy QTY: 8. 00 is not medically necessary and appropriate.