MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0098397		
Date Assigned:	05/29/2015	Date of Injury:	04/26/2013
Decision Date:	07/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/21/2015

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, Pain Management

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 April 26, 2013. She reported upper back, mid back, lower back and buttock pain with pain radiating to bilateral lower extremities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral joint and ligament sprain and strain and thoracic sprain/strain. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, acupuncture, medications and work restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of continued upper back, mid back, lower back and buttock pain with pain radiating to bilateral lower extremities and associated tingling and numbness of the lower extremities. The injured worker reported an industrial injury in 2013, resulting in the above noted pain. She was treated conservatively without complete resolution of the pain. She reported pain prior to non- industrial related chemotherapy however reported worsened pain following non-industrial related chemotherapy. She reported requiring double the amount of pain medication daily. Evaluation on April 23, 2015, revealed continued pain as noted. Electrodiagnostic studies of the lower extremities and pool therapy was recommended. Evaluation on February 3, 2015, revealed continued pain increased with cold weather. Pool therapy for 12 visits was requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pool therapy 12 visits: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic Therapy, Physical Medicine Page(s): 22, 98.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 298, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 22, 98-99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for aquatic therapy, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines state that aquatic therapy is recommended as an optional form of exercise therapy where available as an alternative to land-based physical therapy. They go on to state that it is specifically recommended whenever reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity. Guidelines go on to state that for the recommendation on the number of supervised visits, see physical therapy guidelines. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation indicating why the patient would require therapy in a reduced weight-bearing environment. Furthermore, there is no indication as to how many physical/aquatic therapy sessions the patient has undergone and what specific objective functional improvement has been obtained with the therapy sessions already provided. Finally, there is no statement indicating whether the patient is performing a home exercise program on a regular basis, and whether or not that home exercise program has been modified if it has been determined to be ineffective. Additionally, if the patient has not undergone aquatic therapy previously, the currently requested 12 sessions exceeds the 6-visit trial recommended by guidelines. As such, the currently requested aquatic therapy is not medically necessary.