MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM13-0047151		
Date Assigned:	12/27/2013	Date of Injury:	09/30/2009
Decision Date:	02/20/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/23/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/05/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Ophthalmology and is licensed to practice in Mississippi, New Mexico, and New York. He 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 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 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 claimant has a history of right eye ruptured globe secondary to penetrating injury by a nail. The initial injury occurred at work while removing a roofing nail on 09/30/2009. He underwent repair of the ruptured globe and subsequently pars plana vitrectomy and lensectomy with repair of retinal detachment and placement of silicone oil. Retinal specialty evaluation on 07/31/2013 and 09/11/2013 documented complaints of further decrease in vision over a period of one to two years. The examination showed visual acuity of "hand motion" right eye and 20/40 left eye, right eye aphakia with peripheral anterior iris synechiae, attached retina with scarring, and 90% silicone oil filled vitreous cavity. The diagnosis was right eye attached retina with silicone oil placed and aphakia after penetrating ocular injury. Plan was made for pars plana vitrectomy with silicone oil removal.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Decision for 1 Pars plana vitrectomy, silicone oil tamponade, possible laser treatment or removal gas/air fluid exchange: Overturned

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: Pars plana vitrectomy with silicone oil removal is medically necessary in this case. Although there is no evidence in the medical literature suggesting an optimal time for removal of silicone oil after repair of complex retinal detachments, it is the standard of care to remove oil for the purpose of vision rehabilitation. In this case, the patient underwent vitrectomy and silicone oil placement after ruptured globe and retinal detachment. The silicone oil remained for approximately four years. During that time the retina remained attached and the patient experienced decrease in vision. It is reasonable to expect further visual recovery after silicone oil removal.