

Case Number:	CM15-0092845		
Date Assigned:	05/19/2015	Date of Injury:	07/13/2009
Decision Date:	06/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/14/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 injured worker is a 62-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/13/2009. Diagnoses include left hip pain and left hip degenerative joint disease. Treatment to date has included cortisone injection, home exercise, physical therapy and medications. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the left hip dated 7/09/2014 showed mild bilateral hip osteoarthritis. Per the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 4/27/2015, the injured worker reported persistent pain and clicking with walking. He had a cortisone injection, which provided only temporary relief. Physical examination revealed decreased range of motion with pain. The plan of care included physical therapy and injections and authorization was requested for 8 (2x8) sessions of physical therapy for the left hip and left hip injection under fluoroscopy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy for the left hip Qty: 8: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Physical Medicine is “Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices. (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment.” (Fritz, 2007) In this case, the frequency of the treatment should be reduced from 8 to 3 or less sessions. More sessions will be considered when functional and objective improvement are documented. Therefore, the request for 8 physical therapy sessions for the left hip is not medically necessary.

Left hip injection under fluoroscopy: 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), Hip and Pelvis Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Intra-articular steroid hip injection (IASHI), <http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html>.

Decision rationale: According to ODG guidelines, intra-articular steroid hip injection “Not recommended in early hip osteoarthritis (OA). Under study for moderately advanced or severe hip OA, but if used, should be in conjunction with fluoroscopic guidance. Recommended as an option for short-term pain relief in hip trochanteric bursitis. (Brinks, 2011) Intraarticular glucocorticoid injection with or without elimination of weight-bearing does not reduce the need for total hip arthroplasty in patients with rapidly destructive hip osteoarthritis. (Villoutreix, 2005) A survey of expert opinions showed that substantial numbers of surgeons felt that IASHI was not

therapeutically helpful, may accelerate arthritis progression or may cause increased infectious complications after subsequent total hip arthroplasty. (Kasper, 2005) Historically, using steroids to treat hip OA did not seem to work very well, at least not as well as in the knee. However, the hip joint is one of the most difficult joints in the body to inject accurately, and entry of the therapeutic agent into the synovial space cannot be ensured without fluoroscopic guidance. Fluoroscopically guided steroid injection may be effective. (Lambert, 2007) Corticosteroid injections are effective for greater trochanteric pain syndrome (GTPS) managed in primary care, according to a recent RCT. GTPS, also known as trochanteric bursitis, is a common cause of hip pain. In this first randomized controlled trial assessing the effectiveness of corticosteroid injections vs. usual care in GTPS, a clinically relevant effect was shown at a 3-month follow-up visit for recovery and for pain at rest and with activity, but at a 12-month follow-up visit, the differences in outcome were no longer present. (Brinks, 2011) See also Sacroiliac joint blocks; Sacroiliac joint radiofrequency neurotomy; Trochanteric bursitis injections; & Intra-articular growth hormone (IAGH) injection.” There is no evidence that the patient failed conservative therapies or have recent documentation of severe osteoarthritis or trochanteric bursitis. Therefore, Left hip injection under fluoroscopy is not medically necessary.