

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0070382		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/24/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/07/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/07/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/26/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/24/2013

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer is Licensed in Clinical Psychology 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 expert 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:

Based on the base on the records provided for this independent review, this patient is a 30 year old male who reported an industrial/occupational work-related injury on August 7, 2012, when 2,500 pound steel plate hit him in the legs, waist/pelvis area, knocking him down and pinning him to the asphalt ground nearly; resulting in a crush injury to his bilateral legs with severe fractures, spinal and knee injuries. Psychologically, the patient has been diagnosed with major depressive disorder, single episode, mild; generalized anxiety disorder; posttraumatic stress disorder chronic; male Hypoactive sexual desire disorder due to chronic pain; insomnia related to generalized anxiety disorder and chronic pain; and stress-related physiological response affecting headaches. The patient presents with depressed mood, memory problems for concentration, preoccupation with physical limitations, and nervousness.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**PSYCHOLOGIST CONSULTATION:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation NON-MTUS: AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE 2ND EDITION (2004), 127.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines G Page(s): 101.

**Decision rationale:** A request for one psychological consultation was made and not medically necessary. This request is unclear, it is not known whether a psychological evaluation/assessment is being requested or a psychotherapy treatment session. Utilization review notes reflect that this request is actually for psychiatric consultation for psychotropic medication. However, the request as it was made and submitted to us for this independent medical review states that it is for psychological consultation. The independent medical review process cannot modify a request to correct errors such as this, it is an all-or-none process, the request must be accepted or rejected as written in its entirety without modification. A detailed and comprehensive 13 page psychological consultation dated November 13, 2013 was included in the medical records provided for this request suggesting that the request is not for a psychological evaluation given that one was recently completed. If the request is for psychological sessions or treatment the number of sessions, and psychotherapy requested, should be provided and they were not. If the request is for a psychiatric consultation, it needs to be stated correctly as such. It is suggested that the treating provider could resubmit this request with the specificity clarified, if it is still medically necessary. This decision is not a reflection of the patient's need for treatment, it is only a reflection of the lack of clarity of the request. Therefore, the request for psychologist consultation is not medically necessary.