

Case Number:	CM15-0111980		
Date Assigned:	06/18/2015	Date of Injury:	09/17/2013
Decision Date:	07/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/10/2015

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 25 year old male with an industrial injury dated 09/17/2013. The injured worker's diagnoses include cervical sprain/strain /contusion with muscle spasms, blunt head trauma and post traumatic headaches. Treatment consisted of Ibuprofen 800mg, chiropractic treatments and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 05/27/2015, the injured worker reported intermittent moderate neck pain with stiffness, greater on the right side. Objective findings revealed tenderness to palpitation in the cervical paraspinal musculature and restricted range of motion with pain. The treating physician prescribed physical therapy 2x6 and urine drug screen for next visit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy 2 x 6: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173-175, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Physical therapy guidelines.

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 2 x 6 is not medically necessary or appropriate.

Urine drug screen next visit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Urine Drug Testing.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing, page 43.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Guidelines, urine drug screening is recommended as an option before a therapeutic trial of opioids and for on-going management to differentiate issues of abuse, addiction, misuse, or poor pain control; none of which apply to this patient who has been prescribed long-term opioid this chronic injury. Presented medical reports from the provider have unchanged chronic severe pain symptoms with unchanged clinical findings of restricted range and tenderness without acute new deficits or red-flag condition changes. Treatment plan remains unchanged with continued medication refills without change in dosing or prescription for chronic pain. There is no report of aberrant behaviors, illicit drug use, and report of acute injury or change in clinical findings or risk factors to support frequent UDS. Documented abuse, misuse, poor pain control, history of unexpected positive results for a non-prescribed scheduled drug or illicit drug or history of negative results for prescribed medications may warrant UDS and place the patient in a higher risk level; however, none are provided. The Urine drug screen next visit is not medically necessary or appropriate.