

Case Number:	CM15-0093916		
Date Assigned:	05/20/2015	Date of Injury:	10/08/2014
Decision Date:	09/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/15/2015

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 is a 58 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 10-08-14. Initial complaints and diagnoses are not available. Treatments to date include medications and a cortisone injection. Diagnostic studies are not addressed. Current complaints include pain in the bilateral shoulders, neck, and bilateral hands-wrists. Current diagnoses include cervical and lumbar spine sprain and strain with degenerative disc disease, bilateral shoulder sprain and strain with acromioclavicular joint osteoarthritis, right elbow lateral epicondylitis, bilateral hand first carpometacarpal joint pain. In a progress note dated 04-20-15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as home exercise program, as well as physical therapy to the cervical and lumbar spine, right shoulder and elbow and bilateral wrist and hand. The requested treatment includes physical therapy to 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 2 times a week for 6 weeks for the cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG-TWC), Section: Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, pages 98-99.

Decision rationale: Time-limited care plan with specific defined goals, assessment of functional benefit with modification of ongoing treatment based upon the patient's progress in meeting those goals and the provider's continued monitoring of successful outcome is stressed by MTUS guidelines. Therapy is considered medically necessary when the services require the judgment, knowledge, and skills of a qualified physical therapist due to the complexity and sophistication of the therapy and the physical condition of the patient. Submitted reports have no acute flare-up or specific physical limitations to support for physical/ occupational therapy. The Chronic Pain Guidelines allow for 9-10 visits of therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It is unclear how many PT sessions have been completed; however, the submitted reports have not identified clear specific functional improvement in ADLs, functional status, or decrease in medication and medical utilization nor have there been a change in neurological compromise or red-flag findings demonstrated from the formal physical therapy already rendered to support further treatment. Submitted reports have also not adequately demonstrated the indication to support for excessive quantity of PT sessions without extenuating circumstances established beyond the guidelines. The Physical therapy 2 times a week for 6 weeks for the cervical spine is not medically necessary or appropriate.