MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0072333		
Date Assigned:	04/22/2015	Date of Injury:	05/10/2011
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/16/2015

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 53-year-old, female who sustained a work related injury on 5/10/11. The diagnoses have included cervical spine musculoligamentous strain/sprain, cervical radiculitis, cervical spine disc protrusions, right shoulder strain/sprain and tendinitis, right shoulder impingement syndrome, right elbow epicondylitis, right wrist sprain/strain, rule out carpal tunnel syndrome, and chronic right wrist overuse syndrome. The treatments have included physical therapy, MRIs and medications. In the PR-2 dated 3/18/15, the injured worker complains of neck, right shoulder and right elbow pain. She also complains of pain and numbness in the right wrist. She rates all pain an 8/10. This has decreased from 8-9/10 noted at last visit. She states that treatments are helping with the pain. The treatment plan is to continue aquatic therapy and a referral for EMG/NCV studies of upper extremities.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Aquatic Therapy, six sessions: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic Therapy.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines aquatic therapy Page(s): 22.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on aquatic therapy states: Aquatic therapy Recommended as an optional form of exercise therapy, where available, as an alternative to land based physical therapy. 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. For recommendations on the number of supervised visits, see Physical medicine. Water exercise improved some components of health-related quality of life, balance, and stair climbing in females with fibromyalgia, but regular exercise and higher intensities may be required to preserve most of these gains. (Tomas-Carus, 2007) There is no indication in the provided documentation that this patient has a condition such as extreme obesity that would preclude the patient from land-based physical therapy. The request for physical therapy is within the recommended number of session but he need for aquatic versus land-based physical therapy has not been established. For these reasons, criteria have not been met for the requested service and it is not medically necessary.

Electromyography/Nerve Conduction Velocity of bilateral upper extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173-174.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure; Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electrodiagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities(NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks. The assessment may include sensory-evoked potentials (SEPs) if spinal stenosis or spinal cord myelopathy is suspected. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding next steps, including the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, compute tomography [CT] for bony structures). Additional studies may be considered to further define problem areas. The recent evidence indicates cervical disk annular tears may be missed on MRIs. The clinical significance of such a finding is unclear, as it may not correlate temporally or anatomically with symptoms. The provided documentation does not show any signs of emergence of red flags. There is evidence of neurologic dysfunction on exam but only on the right side. There is no mention of planned invasive procedures. There are no subtle neurologic findings listed on the physical exam. Conservative treatment has not been exhausted. For these reasons criteria for special diagnostic testing has not been met per the ACOEM for bilateral EMG/NCV. Therefore, the request is not certified.