

Case Number:	CM15-0010282		
Date Assigned:	01/27/2015	Date of Injury:	05/07/2001
Decision Date:	03/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/24/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/17/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 77 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/7/01. She has reported back, neck and shoulder injury. Treatment to date has included physical therapy. (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of cervical spine performed on 10/17/14 revealed intervertebral disc disease and degenerative changes, unchanged disc disease, worsened moderate left sided neural foraminal narrowing, slightly worsened mild to moderate bilateral neural foraminal narrowing and mild to moderate left lateral recess encroachment with moderate to marked left sided neural foraminal narrowing at C5-6. (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of left shoulder performed on 10/10/14 revealed moderate to marked tendonitis of supraspinatus, infraspinatus, distal subscapularis and mild to moderate tenosynovitis, degenerative changes of the glenohumeral joint and mild amount of subacromial/sub deltoid bursal fluid with a small glenohumeral joint effusion. Currently, the injured worker complains of continued pain and stiffness and weakness in bilateral shoulders and cervical thoracoscapular, thoracolumbar and lumbosacral areas. Pain is noted to be improving with physical therapy. On 12/24/14 Utilization Review non-certified 8 physical therapy visits for lower back, noting the lack of functional objective improvement from the previous 35 sessions. The MTUS, ACOEM Guidelines, was cited. On 1/17/15, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of 8 physical therapy visits for lower back.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Eight (8) physical therapy visits for the lower back: 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 Medicine Page(s): 98.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Physical Medicine is “Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices.(Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007)”. There is no documentation of objective findings that support musculoskeletal dysfunction requiring more physical therapy. There is no documentation that the patient can NOT benefit from home exercise. There is no documentation of the outcome of previous physical therapy sessions. Therefore Eight (8) physical therapy visits for the lower back is not medically necessary.