

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0018964		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/09/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/21/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/25/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/20/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/02/2015

### 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 38 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on August 24, 2009. She has reported persistent forearm pain and tenderness and has been diagnosed with left ankle internal derangement, acute traction injury of right upper extremity with persistent residuals and probable neurapraxia, and chronic lumbar spine sprain/strain injury secondary to painful gait. Treatment has included medications, medical imaging, cortisone injections, therapy, and work modification. Currently the injured worker has right forearm pain with tenderness and dorsal ankle tenderness with restricted range of motion. The treatment plan included physical therapy for the left ankle. On January 20, 2015 Utilization Review non certified additional physical therapy x 8 visits of the left ankle citing the MTUS guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Additional physical therapy x 8 visits for the left ankle:** 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 physical therapy is not medically necessary and appropriate.