

Case Number:	CM15-0091993		
Date Assigned:	05/18/2015	Date of Injury:	06/14/1989
Decision Date:	06/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/13/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 was a 68 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury, June 17, 1989. The injured worker previously received the following treatments Hydrocodone, ankle support high top boots, Tramadol, Hydrocodone, Zorvolex, aqua therapy, treadmill, [REDACTED] membership, Ibuprofen and x-rays of the cervical spine, left elbow. The injured worker was diagnosed with lumbar degenerative disc disease and osteoarthritis of the right ankle. According to progress note of March 12, 2015, the injured workers chief complaint was upper extremity back pain that kept the injured worker awake. The injured worker was taking more pain medication since expiration of the [REDACTED] membership. The injured worker was utilizing the trend mill and aqua therapy. The injured worker would rather get the [REDACTED] membership instead of the Hydrocodone medication. The physical exam noted severe muscle wasting. The ankle brace/AFO help stabilize the severe instability of the right ankle. The injured worker ambulates with an abnormal gait with braces. There was weakness in the bilateral lower extremities. There was more back support with the brace when the injured worker walked. The injured worker received muscle and joint exercises by walking in the pool around the edge. The treatment plan included [REDACTED] 1 year membership.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

[REDACTED] 1-year membership: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines(ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Exercise, Pages 46-47.

Decision rationale: It can be expected that the patient had been instructed in an independent home exercise program to supplement the formal physical therapy the patient had received and to continue with strengthening post discharge from PT. Although the MTUS Guidelines stress the importance of a home exercise program and recommend daily exercises, there is no evidence to support the medical necessity for access to the equipment available with a gym/pool membership versus resistive thera-bands to perform isometrics and eccentric exercises. It is recommended that the patient continue with the independent home exercise program as prescribed in physical therapy. The accumulated wisdom of the peer-reviewed, evidence-based literature is that musculoskeletal complaints are best managed with the eventual transfer to an independent home exercise program. Most pieces of gym equipment are open chain, i.e., the feet are not on the ground when the exercises are being performed. As such, training is not functional and important concomitant components, such as balance, recruitment of postural muscles, and coordination of muscular action, are missed. Again, this is adequately addressed with a home exercise program. Core stabilization training is best addressed with floor or standing exercises that make functional demands on the body, using body weight. These cannot be reproduced with machine exercise units. There is no peer-reviewed, literature-based evidence that a gym membership or personal trainer is indicated nor is it superior to what can be conducted with a home exercise program. There is, in fact, considerable evidence-based literature that the less dependent an individual is on external services, supplies, appliances, or equipment, the more likely they are to develop an internal locus of control and self-efficacy mechanisms resulting in more appropriate knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. The [REDACTED] 1-year membership is not medically necessary and appropriate.