

Case Number:	CM14-0170796		
Date Assigned:	10/23/2014	Date of Injury:	06/19/2014
Decision Date:	06/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/26/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/15/2014

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. 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 27 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 06/19/2014. The initial complaints or symptoms included a right metacarpal fracture, laceration to the head and concussion due to a motor vehicle accident. The injured worker was diagnosed as having closed fracture, internal derangement of the knee, concussion, and open wound of the head. Treatment to date has included conservative care, medications, sutures to the scalp, medications, x-rays, and an unknown amount of physical therapy. At the time of the request for authorization, the injured worker complained of continued pain to the top of head, right hand, and right knee with increased popping in the right ankle. The diagnoses include fracture of the right 5th metacarpal, concussion and joint effusion. The request for authorization included 8 sessions of physical therapy for the right knee.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy for the right knee, twice weekly for four weeks: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): table 13-6. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Knee and Leg Chapter.

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 for the right knee, twice weekly for four weeks is not medically necessary and appropriate.