

Case Number:	CM15-0093541		
Date Assigned:	05/19/2015	Date of Injury:	10/01/2010
Decision Date:	06/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/15/2015
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: 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:

This is a 60 year old female with an October 1, 2010 date of injury. A progress note dated March 27, 2015 documents subjective findings (persistent neck pain with associated cervicogenic headaches as well as radicular symptoms in both upper extremities, right greater than left; pain rated at a level of 7/10), objective findings (tenderness to palpation of the bilateral posterior cervical musculature with increased muscle rigidity; numerous trigger points that are palpable and tender throughout the cervical paraspinal muscles; decreased range of motion of the cervical spine with obvious guarding; decreased motor strength of the right upper extremity; decreased right grip strength; decreased sensation bilateral upper extremities and bilateral hands with mild linear atrophy; ganglion cyst noted in the right anterior radial aspect of the wrist), and current diagnoses (cervical spondylosis, severe in nature, with associated retrolisthesis; bilateral lower extremity radiculopathy, right greater than left; possible carpal tunnel syndrome; reactionary depression and anxiety; right wrist ganglion cyst; medication-induced gastritis). Treatments to date have included medications, psychotherapy, chiropractic treatments, trigger point injections, physical therapy (not helpful), cervical provocative discogram (January 31, 2013; showed positive results at C5-6 greater than C6-7), computed tomography scan of the cervical spine (January 31, 2013; showed annular fissures and disc bulge), electromyogram (April 18, 2011; showed bilateral C5-6 radiculopathy and evidence of right carpal tunnel syndrome), and magnetic resonance imaging of the cervical spine (March 22, 2011; showed severe spondylosis with a retrolisthesis). The treating physician documented a plan of care that included physical therapy for the cervical spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy, Cervical Spine QTY: 12: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 8-9.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines physical medicine Page(s): 98-99.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on physical medicine states: 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) Physical Medicine Guidelines Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. The goal of physical therapy is graduation to home therapy after a certain amount of recommended sessions. The patient has already completed a course of physical therapy. The request is in excess of these recommendations per the California MTUS. There is no explanation why the patient would not be moved to home therapy after completing the recommended amount of supervised sessions. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.