

Case Number:	CM13-0049251		
Date Assigned:	12/27/2013	Date of Injury:	05/05/2013
Decision Date:	04/04/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/28/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/07/2013

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. 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:

This is a 50-year-old female who was injured in a work-related accident on 5/5/13 when she was punctured by a needle from a diabetic syringe. The records documented that she was given appropriate immunizations, laboratory work up, and assessment which were reportedly negative. The records also documented that the claimant has been taken off of work for anxiety-related issues. A recent clinical assessment for review included no documentation of prior psychological assessment regarding the claimant's current diagnosis of anxiety. It stated that previous assessment by ██████ documented that the claimant had psychological complaints in regard to anxiety but had a normal mental status examination, was communicative, and had no positive findings on assessment. Referral for psychological evaluation based upon the claimant's ongoing anxiety complaints at this stage in the clinical course of care was recommended.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Psychological consult and treatment: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Chapter (ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 7), pg. 127

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Chapter (ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 7), pg. 127

Decision rationale: Based on California ACOEM Guidelines, the request for psychological consult and treatment in this case would appear warranted. Consultation for psychological assessment would be indicated to "help aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, or therapeutic management of the patient." The patient continues to have an anxiety ridden state several months following a needle prick injury. This would appear reasonable given the claimant's current clinical presentation and course of care to date.