

Case Number:	CM13-0036627		
Date Assigned:	12/13/2013	Date of Injury:	06/26/2013
Decision Date:	02/11/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/23/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/21/2013

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 Orthopedic Surgery 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.

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 20-year-old female who was injured in a work related accident on 06/26/13. Recent clinical assessment of 09/11/13 gives the claimant a diagnosis of a left foot laceration with no formal findings documented on examination. Further records indicate that the claimant was with previous numbness from laceration, which at present is not well defined. Further follow up of 11/15/13, once again, recommended a referral to a plastic surgeon with objective findings of a tender scar and good distal pulses. Formal clinical imaging is not documented.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Referral to a Plastic Surgeon: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) CA MTUS ACOEM OMPG (Second Edition, 2004), Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) CA MTUS ACOEM OMPG (Second Edition, 2004), Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

Decision rationale: The Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) CA MTUS ACOEM

OMPG (Second Edition, 2004), Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127. The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale: Based on California ACOEM Guidelines, referral to a plastic surgeon in this case cannot be supported. The records indicate that the claimant is with a diagnosis of "painful scar" with failure to demonstrate recent treatment that has been utilized in regard to her current complaints. At present, the claimant's clinical presentation does not indicate any degree of a surgical process. The specific consultation in this case, thus would not be indicated at present.