

Case Number:	CM14-0102003		
Date Assigned:	07/30/2014	Date of Injury:	07/24/2008
Decision Date:	09/26/2014	UR Denial Date:	06/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/02/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Management, and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 37-year-old female with a July 24, 2008 date of injury. At the time of the Decision for hand, wrist, and elbow home exercise kit; home exercise kit lumbar; and delivery & set up, there is documentation of subjective (not specified) and objective (not specified) findings, current diagnoses (pain in joint and other and unspecified disc disorder), and treatment to date (not specified). There is no documentation that a home exercise programs is recommended, the patient has been taught appropriate home exercises by a therapist or medical provider, and a description of the exact contents of the kit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hand, Wrist, an Elbow home exercise Kit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Exercise and Knee & Leg, Home Exercise Kit.

Decision rationale: MTUS does not address the issue. ODG identifies that there is strong evidence that exercise programs, including aerobic conditioning and strengthening, are superior

to treatment programs that do not include exercise; that there is no sufficient evidence to support the recommendation of any particular exercise regimen over any other exercise regimen; that a therapeutic exercise program should be initiated at the start of any treatment or rehabilitation program, unless exercise is contraindicated; and that such programs should emphasize education, independence, and the importance of an on-going exercise regime. In addition, ODG identifies a home exercise kit is recommended as an option where home exercise programs are recommended. Furthermore, Guidelines identify documentation that the patient has been taught appropriate home exercises by a therapist or medical provider and a description of the exact contents of the kit, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a home exercise kit. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of pain in joint and other and unspecified disc disorder. However, there is no documentation that a home exercise programs is recommended, the patient has been taught appropriate home exercises by a therapist or medical provider, and a description of the exact contents of the kit. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for hand, wrist, and elbow home exercise kit is not medically necessary or appropriate.

Home exercise kit Lumbar: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Exercise and Knee & Leg, Home Exercise Kit.

Decision rationale: MTUS does not address the issue. ODG identifies that there is strong evidence that exercise programs, including aerobic conditioning and strengthening, are superior to treatment programs that do not include exercise; that there is no sufficient evidence to support the recommendation of any particular exercise regimen over any other exercise regimen; that a therapeutic exercise program should be initiated at the start of any treatment or rehabilitation program, unless exercise is contraindicated; and that such programs should emphasize education, independence, and the importance of an on-going exercise regime. In addition, ODG identifies a home exercise kit is recommended as an option where home exercise programs are recommended. Furthermore, Guidelines identify documentation that the patient has been taught appropriate home exercises by a therapist or medical provider and a description of the exact contents of the kit, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a home exercise kit. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of pain in joint and other and unspecified disc disorder. However, there is no documentation that a home exercise programs is recommended, the patient has been taught appropriate home exercises by a therapist or medical provider, and a description of the exact contents of the kit. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for home exercise kit lumbar is not medically necessary or appropriate.

Delivery & set up: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary equipment is not medically necessary, none of the associated parts are medically necessary.