MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.
Independent Medical Review
P.O. Box 138009
Sacramento, CA 95813-8009
(855) 865-8873 Fax: (916) 605-4270

MAXIMUS Federal Services

Notice of Independent Medical Review Determination

Dated: 11/25/2013

[redacted]

[redacted]

Employee:	[redacted]
Claim Number:	
Date of UR Decision:	7/18/2013
Date of Injury:	10/13/2011
IMR Application Received:	8/5/2013
MAXIMUS Case Number:	CM13-0007381

1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for a **psych consultation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

2) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for a **sleep consultation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW DECISION AND RATIONALE

An application for Independent Medical Review was filed on 8/5/2013 disputing the Utilization Review Denial dated 7/18/2013. A Notice of Assignment and Request for Information was provided to the above parties on 9/6/2013. A decision has been made for each of the treatment and/or services that were in dispute:

1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for a **psych consultation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

2) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for a **sleep consultation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Medical Qualifications of the Expert Reviewer:
The independent Medical Doctor who made the decision has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Psychologist 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 treatments and/or services at issue.

Expert Reviewer Case Summary:
The claimant is a 34 y.o. male with date of injury of 10/13/11. According to the medical records provided, the claimant has experienced several physical conditions involving his lumbar region and experiences “right sacroiliac joint pain” as a result of his work related injury. There is no documentation suggesting any type of psychological condition. There is, however, mention of “sleep disturbance”, but no other diagnostic information. As a result of the insufficient information, this writer is unable to ascertain any type of diagnosis or diagnostic information relevant to the clinical issues under dispute.

Documents Reviewed for Determination:
The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:

- Application of Independent Medical Review
- Utilization Review Determination
- Medical Records from Claims Administrator
- Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS)

1) **Regarding the request for psych consultation:**

Section of the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Relied Upon by the Expert Reviewer to Make His/Her Decision
The Claims Administrator based its decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) Guidelines, Chapter 7, page 127, which is not a part of the MTUS.

The Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 101, which is part of the MTUS, and on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Chapter 7, which is not a part of the MTUS.

Rationale for the Decision:
There were no medical records provided for review describing any psychological symptoms that would warrant a request for a psychological consultation /evaluation. **The request for a psych consultation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

2) **Regarding the request for sleep consultation:**

Section of the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Relied Upon by the Expert Reviewer to Make His/Her Decision
The Claims Administrator based its decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) Guidelines, Chapter 7, and also specifically cited page 127, which is not a part of the MTUS.

The Expert Reviewer found that no section of the MTUS was applicable. Per the Strength of Evidence hierarchy established by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Workers' Compensation, the Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the ACOEM Guidelines, 2nd Edition, (2004), Chapter 7, no page number(s) cited.

Rationale for the Decision:
There were no medical records provided for review that demonstrated any sleep issues, other than mentioning the employee's subjective report of "sleep disturbance", that would warrant a request for a sleep consultation. **The request for a sleep consultation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Effect of the Decision:
The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the final determination of the Administrative Director, Division of Workers' Compensation. With respect to the medical necessity of the treatment in dispute, this determination is binding on all parties.

In accordance with California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h), a determination of the administrative director may be reviewed only if a verified appeal is filed with the appeals board for hearing and served on all interested parties within 30 days of the date of mailing of the determination to the employee or the employer. The determination of the administrative director shall be presumed to be correct and shall be set aside only upon proof by clear and convincing evidence of one or more of the grounds for appeal listed in Labor Code Section 4610.6(h)(1) through (5).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations
Division of Workers' Compensation
1515 Clay Street, 18th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

/ejf

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.