

Case Number:	CM13-0029882		
Date Assigned:	11/27/2013	Date of Injury:	11/05/2002
Decision Date:	01/21/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/17/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/27/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Internal Medicine, has a subspecialty in Cardiology 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 physician 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:

The patient is a 60 year old male who reported an injury on 11/05/2002. The mechanism of injury was not submitted. The patient has had no complaints. As noted in the physician progress reports submitted for review, the patient states he feels good. The reports state that the patient's blood pressure is controlled with medication.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

All lab work to be done every 6 months: 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 Lab Test Online Website

Decision rationale: Neither the California MTUS nor the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine address routine laboratory screening. The clinical documentation submitted for review did not provide the patient's medical history, pre-existing conditions, nor was the submitted request specific as to the specific lab, condition to be monitored or medication being tested. The clinical notes submitted do mention blood pressure, but no specific request was

mentioned to monitor this condition. As such, the request for all lab work to be done every 6 months is not medically necessary and appropriate.