

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0129829		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/01/2003
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/17/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/24/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/06/2015

### 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: North Carolina  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 41 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on September 1, 2003. She reported continual trauma-type injuries to her upper extremities due to overuse. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, bilateral thoracic outlet syndrome, tenosynovitis of the upper extremities bilaterally, left elbow ulnar neuropathy, adjustment disorder with anxiety and depression, dysautonomia and headaches associated with thoracic outlet syndrome. Treatment to date has included surgery, physical therapy and medications. On March 19, 2015, the injured worker reported to be doing much better since her surgery. Her physical therapy does increase her pain but overall she is improving. She stated that she gets tight muscles in the cervical region and shoulders but it has improved. The treatment plan included physical therapy and medications. On June 24, 2015, Utilization Review non-certified the request for MRI of bilateral shoulders. A request for physical therapy three times six for thoracic outlet syndrome has been modified to physical therapy four sessions (two times two) for thoracic outlet syndrome. The California MTUS Guidelines were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Physical therapy 3 times a week for 6 weeks for thoracic outlet syndrome: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines physical medicine Page(s): 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on physical medicine states: Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices. (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007) Physical Medicine Guidelines: Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks. Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks. Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. The requested amount of physical therapy is in excess of California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines. There is no objective explanation why the patient would need excess physical therapy and not be transitioned to active self-directed physical medicine. The request is not medically necessary.

**MRI of bilateral shoulders:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on shoulder complaints states: Primary criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag (e.g., indications of intra-abdominal or

cardiac problems presenting as shoulder problems); Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurovascular dysfunction (e.g., cervical root problems presenting as shoulder pain, weakness from a massive rotator cuff tear, or the presence of edema, cyanosis or Raynaud's phenomenon); Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure (e.g., a full thickness rotator cuff tear not responding to conservative treatment). The provided clinical documentation for review does not meet these criteria as outlined above and the request is thus not medically necessary.