

Case Number:	CM13-0051872		
Date Assigned:	12/27/2013	Date of Injury:	10/20/1999
Decision Date:	02/19/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/02/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/09/2013

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:

The patient is a 59-year-old gentleman who was injured in a work related accident on 10/20/99. According to the records provided for review, following a course of failed conservative care the claimant was scheduled and certified for left shoulder open reduction internal fixation of the humeral shaft with a possible reverse total shoulder arthroplasty and use of bone grafting. There is a request for an assistant surgery for the above mentioned procedure.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

An assistant surgeon: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Milliman Care Guidelines 17th Edition: Assistant Surgeon Guidelines

Decision rationale: The California MTUS ACOEM Guidelines are silent. When looking at Milliman Care Guidelines, an assistant surgeon would be medically necessary. Given the acute nature of the surgery in question and guideline criteria, the assistant use of an operative surgeon in this case would appear medically necessary.

