

Case Number:	CM15-0117615		
Date Assigned:	06/25/2015	Date of Injury:	10/29/2009
Decision Date:	07/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/18/2015

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 56 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 10/29/2009. The injured worker was diagnosed with lumbosacral sprain/strain and myalgia. Recent diagnostic testing includes a lumbosacral magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) performed on May 8, 2015. Treatment to date included diagnostic testing, physical therapy, home exercise program and medications. According to the primary treating physician's progress report on May 13, 2015, the injured worker was re-evaluated for the lumbosacral spine and reports his condition is improving and would like to return to work full time. The injured worker rates his pain level at 2/10 and intermittent with less frequent and less intense radiating pain to the right lower extremity and foot. Examination demonstrated gait and heel to toe ambulation caused no pain. There was mild tenderness to palpation of the bilateral paralumbar muscles without palpable trigger points. Range of motion was unrestricted. Straight leg raise was negative. Motor strength was normal with mildly decreased sensation of the right L5 dermatome. Knee and ankle jerks were noted at 1/4 bilaterally. Current medications are listed as Naprosyn and Flexeril. Treatment plan consists of continuing with home exercise program and proper care, continuing medication regimen, return to full duty and additional physical therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Additional Physical Therapy x6: 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 Additional Physical Therapy x6 is not medically necessary and appropriate.