

Case Number:	CM14-0009306		
Date Assigned:	02/14/2014	Date of Injury:	11/21/2011
Decision Date:	06/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/23/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/23/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in Illinois. 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 injured worker is a 51-year-old male who reported an injury on 11/21/2011. The mechanism of injury was not provided in the clinical documentation submitted. Within the clinical note dated 12/16/2013, the injured worker complained of blood pressure running 150 to 180 over 90 to 110. He noted he was trying a medication which did not bring blood pressure down. Upon the physical exam, the provider noted the injured worker's blood pressure to be 209/115, with heart rhythm without gallop. The clinical documentation submitted was largely illegible. The provider requested for a hemodynamic study to assess the systemic vascular resistance index. The request for authorization was provided dated 12/16/2013.

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 base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Diabetes Chapter, Hypertensive Medication

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation MedlinePlus, Plethysmography, online database, <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/ency/article/003771.htm>

Decision rationale: The injured worker complained of blood pressure running 150 to 180 over 90 to 110. He noted he was trying the medication which did not improve blood pressure. MedlinePlus notes plethysmography is used to measure changes in volume in different parts of the body. This can help check blood. The test may be done to check for blood clots in the arms and legs, or to measure how much air you can hold in your lungs. There was lack of objective findings indicating the injured worker to be at risk for blood clots in the arms and legs. Additionally, the request submitted was not specific to the exact test to be completed. Therefore, the request for hemodynamic study is not medically necessary.