

Case Number:	CM15-0038911		
Date Assigned:	03/09/2015	Date of Injury:	05/15/2014
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/02/2015

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: Maryland, Texas, Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Allergy and Immunology, Rheumatology

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 47 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 05/15/2014. She reported an injury to her bilateral knees with complaints of left greater than right knee pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left knee occult medial meniscal tear with meniscal cyst and area of chondromalacia. Treatment to date has included knee surgery, aquatic therapy, and medications. In a progress note dated 02/04/2015, the injured worker presented for an orthopedic evaluation regarding injury sustained to her left knee. The treating physician reported the injured worker is improving slower than expected while performing aquatic therapy with some benefit and would like her to continue twice a week for four weeks and was recommended Synvisc injection. The UR found the request for Pool therapy, 8 session to be non-certify citing the MTUS.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pool therapy, 8 sessions: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic therapy Page(s): 58.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines MD Guidelines, Aquatic Therapy Page(s): 22, 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Aquatic therapy and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines MD Guidelines, Aquatic Therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines state that "Aquatic therapy (including swimming) can minimize the effects of gravity, so it is specifically recommended where reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity." MD Guidelines similarly states, "If the patient has subacute or chronic LBP and meets criteria for a referral for supervised exercise therapy and has co-morbidities (e.g., extreme obesity, significant degenerative joint disease, etc.) that preclude effective participation in a weight-bearing physical activity, then a trial of aquatic therapy is recommended for the treatment of subacute or chronic LBP." The medical documents provided do not indicate any concerns that patient was extremely obese. Imaging results provided do not report severe degenerative joint disease. MRI form 2/26/15 show minimal degenerative changes. Records provided indicate that the patient received physical therapy sessions. No objective clinical findings were provided, however, that delineated the outcome of those physical therapy treatments. Additionally, medical notes provided did not detail reason why the patient is unable to effectively participate in weight-bearing physical activities. Regarding the number of visits, MTUS states "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." ODG states "Patients should be formally assessed after a "six-visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted." At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. The number of requested visits is in excess of the initial six-visit trial. The treating physician does not document a reason to grant additional visits in excess of this trial. As such, the current request for Pool therapy, 8 sessions is not medically necessary.