

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0025705		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/18/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/28/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/09/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/10/2015

### 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 35 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 02/28/2013. Current diagnoses include status post left knee work related injury, status post left knee arthroscopic limited synovectomy, left knee lateral subluxation of the patella with patellofemoral dysfunction, and persistent left knee pain. Previous treatments included medication management, left knee arthroscopy, and physical therapy. Report dated 11/19/2014 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included knee pain. Pain level was rated as 6 out of 10 on the visual analog scale (VAS). Physical examination was positive for abnormal findings. Physical therapy progress notes were included for review and indicate that 8 visits of physical therapy have been completed. Utilization review performed on 01/09/2015 non-certified a prescription for additional physical therapy 2 x 6, Ultram, and Motrin, based on the clinical information submitted does not support medical necessity. The reviewer referenced the California MTUS in making this decision.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Additional physical therapy 2 x 6: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines.

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

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend up to 10 sessions with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the request exceeds the amount of PT recommended by the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy is not medically necessary.

**Continue Ultram:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use Page(s): 76-80.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Ultram, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Ultram is not medically necessary.

**Continue Motrin:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-72.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Motrin, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction or reduction in numeric rating scale) or any objective functional improvement to support long-term use despite the recommendations of the CA MTUS. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Motrin is not medically necessary.