

Case Number:	CM15-0114201		
Date Assigned:	06/22/2015	Date of Injury:	05/31/2014
Decision Date:	07/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/12/2015

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 32 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/31/14. He reported fell backwards and injured his back. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left hip hamstring tendon tear ischial tuberosity. Treatment to date has included oral medications including opioids, physical therapy, activity restrictions and home exercise program. (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of lumbar spine and (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of pelvis did not report any injury and x-rays of lumbar spine and left hip are unremarkable. Currently, the injured worker complains of ongoing severe left hip pain. He is temporarily totally disabled. Physical exam noted normal exam of lumbar spine and significantly painful and tender range of motion of left hip with significant tenderness over the ischial tuberosity. The treatment plan included a request for authorization for (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of pelvis, prescriptions for Celebrex, Lexapro, Soma and Percocet and request for physical therapy 12 sessions to left hip.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI scan with 3.0 tesla of the pelvis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): Chapter 12- Low Back Complaints, Imaging, pages 303-304.

Decision rationale: The patient continues with unchanged symptom complaints, non-progressive clinical findings without any acute change to supporting repeating the Pelvic MRI. ACOEM Treatment Guidelines Diagnostic and Treatment Considerations, states Criteria for ordering imaging studies include Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electrodiagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports for this chronic injury have not adequately demonstrated the indication for MRI of Pelvis nor document any specific progressive deteriorating clinical findings with pathological surgical lesion, failed conservative treatment, or ADL limitations to support this imaging study. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MRI scan with 3.0 tesla of the pelvis is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Physical therapy to include ultrasound, massage and therapeutic exercises three times four left hip: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment 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 to include ultrasound, massage and therapeutic exercises three times four left hip is not medically necessary and appropriate.