MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0077144		
Date Assigned:	06/04/2015	Date of Injury:	09/29/2014
Decision Date:	07/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/22/2015

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 38 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 09/29/2014. Current diagnoses include crush injury to the great second toe with communicated fractures, status post open reduction internal fixation, and fracture of two other toes (as per the injured worker). Previous treatments included medications, fracture boot Cam Walker, wound care, right second toe surgery, physical therapy, and chiropractic. Previous diagnostic studies include an x-ray of the right foot which revealed a fracture at the second digit. Initial injuries occurred to the right foot when a one ton machine rolled over it. Report dated 03/25/2015 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included pain in the right great toe, second toe, third toe, and the ball of the foot. Pain level was not included. Physical examination was positive for limited range of motion in the toe, pain with palpation, pain in the ball of the foot around the second metatarsal, and tenderness in the great toe and third toe with palpation. The treatment plan included prescribing gabapentin and Naprosyn, request for an initial evaluation for a functional restoration program due to significant pain and loss of function. Disputed treatments include 1 initial functional restoration program evaluation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Prospective: 1 Initial Functional Restoration Program Evaluation: Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines functional restoration program page(s): 49.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on functional restoration programs states: Recommended, although research is still ongoing as to how to most appropriately screen for inclusion in these programs. Functional restoration programs (FRPs), a type of treatment included in the category of interdisciplinary pain programs (see Chronic pain programs), were originally developed by Mayer and Gatchel. FRPs were designed to use a medically directed, interdisciplinary pain management approach geared specifically to patients with chronic disabling occupational musculoskeletal disorders. These programs emphasize the importance of function over the elimination of pain. FRPs incorporate components of exercise progression with disability management and psychosocial intervention. Long-term evidence suggests that the benefit of these programs diminishes over time, but still remains positive when compared to cohorts that did not receive an intensive program. (Bendix, 1998) A Cochrane review suggests that there is strong evidence that intensive multidisciplinary rehabilitation with functional restoration reduces pain and improves function of patients with low back pain. The evidence is contradictory when evaluating the programs in terms of vocational outcomes. (Guzman 2001) It must be noted that all studies used for the Cochrane review excluded individuals with extensive radiculopathy, and several of the studies excluded patients who were receiving a pension, limiting the generalizability of the above results. Studies published after the Cochrane review also indicate that intensive programs show greater effectiveness, in particular in terms of return to work, than less intensive treatment. (Airaksinen, 2006) There appears to be little scientific evidence for the effectiveness of multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation compared with other rehabilitation facilities for neck and shoulder pain, as opposed to low back pain and generalized pain syndromes. (Karjalainen, 2003) Treatment is not suggested for longer than 2 weeks without evidence of demonstrated efficacy as documented by subjective and objective gains. For general information see Chronic pain programs. While functional restoration programs are recommended per the California MTUS, the length of time is for 2 weeks unless there is documentation of demonstrated efficacy by subjective and objective gains. The request is within these recommendations and therefore is certified. Therefore, the requested treatment is medically necessary.