

Case Number:	CM14-0005620		
Date Assigned:	01/22/2014	Date of Injury:	12/10/2012
Decision Date:	06/26/2014	UR Denial Date:	01/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/15/2014

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 Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in New York and North Carolina. 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:

The patient is a 23-year-old male who has filed a claim for low back pain associated with an industrial injury date of December 10, 2012. Review of progress notes reports continued pain in the left ankle, with increasing pain in the right ankle and low back due to an altered gait. Patient also experiences headaches. Findings include pain with range of motion and limited mobility of the ankle, with minimal effusion. With regards to the low back, findings include spasm and pain with range of motion. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, ankle bracing, and left ankle surgery. Utilization review from January 09, 2014 denied the request for neurological consult as there is no description of the patient's headaches or of use of first-line treatment; and dental consult as there is no documentation regarding any prescribed medications causing tooth discoloration, and no objective findings to confirm presence of tooth discoloration.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

NEURO CONSULT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation MTUS: ACOEM, , 127

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental

Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations chapter, pages 127 and 156.

Decision rationale: As stated on pages 127 and 156 in the ACOEM Practice Guidelines, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations chapter, occupational health practitioner may refer to other specialists if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. In this case, patient complains of continued headaches. However, there is no description as to the onset, frequency, duration, location, and quality of these headaches. There is also no documentation regarding any trial of treatment modalities in this patient. Therefore, the request for neuro consultation is not medically necessary.

DENTAL CONSULT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG-TWC 2012 Head: Dental Treatments.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations chapter, pages 127 and 156.

Decision rationale: As stated on pages 127 and 156 in the ACOEM Practice Guidelines, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations chapter, occupational health practitioner may refer to other specialists if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. In this case, progress notes indicate that the patient has tooth discoloration from pain medications. However, there is no documentation of patient's pain medications, or description of the tooth discoloration in the progress notes. Tooth discoloration also does not cause any functional impairment. Therefore, the request for dental consult is not medically necessary.