MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0078299		
Date Assigned:	04/29/2015	Date of Injury:	01/02/2014
Decision Date:	05/26/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/31/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/23/2015

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 30 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 1/2/14. She reported pain in her neck and right upper extremity related to repetitive motions. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical disc displacement, right shoulder pain and chronic pain syndrome. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, acupuncture and pain medications. As of the PR2 dated 3/12/15, the injured worker reported increasing stiffness in her neck causing limited range of motion. She has used a theracane in physical therapy and it had alleviated her pain. The treating physician noted increased myofascial tension in the neck and upper back. The treating physician requested a foam roll and a theracane.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Foam roll: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, durable medical equipment.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested item. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on durable medical equipment, DME is primarily and customarily used to serve a medical purpose and generally not useful to a person in the absence of illness or injury. DME equipment is defined as equipment that can withstand repeated use i.e. can be rented and used by successive patients, primarily serves a medical function and is appropriate for use in a patient's home. The equipment itself is not rentable or able to be used by successive patients. The prescribed equipment does not meet the standards of DME per the ODG. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Theracane: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, durable medical equipment.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested item. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on durable medical equipment, DME is primarily and customarily used to serve a medical purpose and generally not useful to a person in the absence of illness or injury. DME equipment is defined as equipment that can withstand repeated use i.e. can be rented and used by successive patients, primarily serves a medical function and is appropriate for use in a patient's home. The equipment itself is not rentable or able to be used by successive patients. The prescribed equipment does not meet the standards of DME per the ODG. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.