

Case Number:	CM15-0119601		
Date Assigned:	06/29/2015	Date of Injury:	04/03/2013
Decision Date:	07/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/19/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 50 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 4/3/13. The injured worker has complaints of pain with any movement of the right wrist. The diagnoses have included status post right thumb/wrist crush injury; status post right dorsal first web space laceration with primary care closure; status post right wrist/scaphoid fracture and right chronic wrist pain radiocarpal. Treatment to date has included right wrist arthroscopy, debridement, synovectomy; splints; transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation unit; continuous passive motion device; tramadol; voltaren; lunesta and protonix. The request was for continuous passive motion device extension.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

CPM device extension: 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), Forearm, Wrist and Hand Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Continuous passive motion (CPM) <http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html>.

Decision rationale: According to ODG guidelines, Continuous passive motion not recommended for shoulder rotator cuff problems, but recommended as an option for adhesive capsulitis, up to 4 weeks/5 days per week. See the Knee Chapter for more information on continuous passive motion devices. Rotator cuff tears: Not recommended after shoulder surgery or for nonsurgical treatment. (Raab, 1996) (BlueCross BlueShield, 2005) An AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Review concluded that evidence on the comparative effectiveness and the harms of various operative and nonoperative treatments for rotator cuff tears is limited and inconclusive. With regard to adding continuous passive motion to postoperative physical therapy, 11 trials yielded moderate evidence for no difference in function or pain, and one study found no difference in range of motion or strength. (Seida, 2010) Adhesive capsulitis: According to this RCT, CPM treatment for adhesive capsulitis provides better response in pain reduction than conventional physical therapy. The CPM group received CPM treatments for 1 h once a day for 20 days during a period of 4 weeks. The PT group had a daily physical therapy treatment including active stretching and pendulum exercises for 1 h once a day for 20 days during a period of 4 weeks. All patients in both groups were also instructed in a standardized home exercise program consisting of passive range of motion and pendulum exercises to be performed every day. In both groups, statistically significant improvements were detected in all outcome measures compared with baseline. Pain reduction, however, evaluated with respect to pain at rest, at movement and at night was better in CPM group. In addition the CPM group showed better shoulder pain index scores than the PT group. (Dundar, 2009) Because adhesive capsulitis involves fibrotic changes to the capsuloligamentous structures, continuous passive motion or dynamic splinting are thought to help elongate collagen fibers. (Page, 2010). There is no documentation of the outcome of 30 days of CPM previously approved. Therefore, the request for CPM device extension is not medically necessary.