

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0090576		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/14/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/06/2003
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/17/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/24/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/11/2015

### 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: Texas, New York, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

### 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 applicant is a represented 64-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic ankle, leg, and low back pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of November 6, 2003. In a Utilization Review report dated April 24, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for 12 sessions of housekeeping services. An April 8, 2015 RFA form and associated progress notes of January 14, 2015 and February 26, 2015 were referenced in the determination. The claims administrator contended that the request in question represented a request for house cleaning, laundry, and bathing assistance, which the applicant was apparently requesting secondary to her severe back pain complaints. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. In a handwritten RFA form seemingly dated April 10, 2015, difficulty to follow, and not entirely legible, the attending provider sought authorization for housekeeper and assistance on a twice weekly basis. In a seemingly attached prescription dated January 14, 2015, the attending provider stated that the applicant needed a housekeeper and assistance to help with cleaning, household chores, laundry, and bathing owing to her issues with severe back pain and attendant emotional distress.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**12 Visits from a housekeeper/ Assistant:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medicare Manual (Rev. 144, 05-06-11), Chapter 7 Home Health Services; section 50.2 (Home Health Aide Services).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Home health services Page(s): 51.

**Decision rationale:** No, the request for 12 visits from a housekeeper/assistant was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted on page 51 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Home Health services are recommended only to deliver otherwise recommended medical treatment to applicants who are home bound. Here, however, there was no clear or compelling evidence set forth on either the January 14, 2015 prescription/progress note or the April 10, 2015 RFA form to the effect that the applicant was home bound and/or bed bound. Page 51 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines also notes that medical treatment does not include homemaker services such as the household cleaning, laundry, and bathing sought here. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.