MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0000955		
Date Assigned:	07/11/2014	Date of Injury:	12/02/2002
Decision Date:	09/03/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/23/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/02/2014

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 Board Certified in Family Practice 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:

A 61-year-old female claimant sustained a work injury on 12/2/02 involving the right flank and low back. She was diagnosed with lumbar disc disease and L4-5 canal stenosis. She had received prior epidural steroid injections. She had a prior history of obesity, smoking, esophageal spasms and left ventricular hypertrophy. A progress note on 11/13/13 indicated she had a BO of 127/73 with +2 leg edema. Due to pedal edema and hypertension a hemodynamic study was requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hemodynamic Study: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence:American Academy of Family Physicians.

Decision rationale: The American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), and the MTUS guidelines do not comment on hemodynamic studies. According to the AFP guidelines, acute without suspicion of cancer should be investigated with a duplex ultrasound. Those with chronic edema can be attributed to cardiac, medication, renal,

thrombosis, etc. In this case, the suspicion for edema and its relationship to probability of a thrombosis or venous insufficiency was not specified. The edema was not specified to be unilateral or bilateral. The type of hemodynamic study and anticipated results were not specified. The request is therefore not medically necessary.