

Case Number:	CM14-0096526		
Date Assigned:	09/15/2014	Date of Injury:	08/03/2001
Decision Date:	10/06/2014	UR Denial Date:	06/03/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/24/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

There were 689 pages provided for this review. It was for physical therapy for eight visits. The request for independent medical review was signed on June 16, 2014. Per the records provided, as of May 19, 2014, the doctor noted the patient had low back and hip pain. The patient had difficulty with any weight-bearing activity and was taking Norco for the pain. The patient has an abnormal gait and arm swelling without assistive devices. There was difficulty standing from a seated position and motor strength was five out of five on the lower extremity. There was a sprain to the lumbar spine. She has had physical therapy two times a week for four weeks and pain management. She underwent prior lumbar surgeries. Diagnostic imaging was not available. There is no summarization of prior physical therapy outcomes were procedures.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy for 8 visits (2 x wk x 4 wks): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG(The Official Disability Guidelines) Low Back, Physical therapy (PT)Physical Therapy Guidelines

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS does permit physical therapy in chronic situations, noting that one should allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. The conditions mentioned are Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks; Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks; and Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. This claimant does not have these conditions. And, after several documented sessions of therapy, it is not clear why the patient would not be independent with self-care at this point. Also, there are especially strong caveats in the MTUS/ACOEM guidelines against over treatment in the chronic situation supporting the clinical notion that the move to independence and an active, independent home program is clinically in the best interest of the patient. They cite: 1. Although mistreating or under treating pain is of concern, an even greater risk for the physician is over treating the chronic pain patient...Over treatment often results in irreparable harm to the patient's socioeconomic status, home life, personal relationships, and quality of life in general. 2. A patient's complaints of pain should be acknowledged. Patient and clinician should remain focused on the ultimate goal of rehabilitation leading to optimal functional recovery, decreased healthcare utilization, and maximal self actualization. This request for more skilled, monitored therapy was appropriately non-certified.