

Case Number:	CM15-0116531		
Date Assigned:	06/24/2015	Date of Injury:	12/17/2004
Decision Date:	07/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/16/2015

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, Pain Management

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 74 year old male who sustained a work related injury December 17, 2004, with an explosion, resulting in traumatic amputations of the first and second DIPs (distal interphalangeal joints). Past history included deep vein thrombosis, hypertension, and obesity. According to a primary treating physician's progress report, dated May 8, 2015, the injured worker presented with chronic right hip pain associated with aching, stiffness, and weakness. He reports right hamstring and buttocks pain is mild but does go to a 6-7/10, with increased activity. Objective findings included; 5' 6" and 240 pounds left sided mid-stroke antalgic gait, wide based, difficult transition from a sit position to a stand, right hip range of motion is restricted with flexion limited to 70 degrees and abduction limited to 50 degrees. There is tenderness of the sacroiliac joint, tenderness of the lateral thigh, trochanter and lateral hamstrings, and Ober's sign is positive. There is tenderness of the sacroiliac joint, left hip and tenderness of the lateral thigh. Light touch sensation is decreased over the posterior thigh, lateral thigh on the right side. Diagnosis is documented as enthesopathy of hip femoral acetabular impingement syndrome, right. Treatment plan included to continue with medication, maintain exercise, and at issue, a request for authorization for a gym membership.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Gym Membership for one month: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Hip and Pelvis, Gym Memberships.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 46-47 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation x Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Hip and Pelvis Chapter, Gym Memberships.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for gym membership, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that exercise is recommended. They go on to state that there is no sufficient evidence to support the recommendation of any particular exercise regimen over any other exercise regimen. ODG states the gym memberships are not recommended as a medical prescription unless a documented home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision has not been effective and there is a need for equipment. Plus, treatment needs to be monitored and administered by medical professionals. With unsupervised programs there is no information flow back to the provider, so he or she can make changes in the prescription, and there may be a risk of further injury to the patient. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed a home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision. Additionally, there is no indication that the patient has been trained on the use of gym equipment, or that the physician is overseeing the gym exercise program. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested gym membership is not medically necessary.