

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM14-0100659 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 07/30/2014 | Date of Injury: | 08/08/2013 |
| Decision Date: | 10/03/2014 | UR Denial Date: | 06/03/2014 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 06/30/2014 |

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 & Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in Nevada. 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 records presented for review indicate that this 27 year-old individual was reportedly injured on August 8, 2013. The mechanism of injury is noted as exposure to toxic substances. The most recent progress note, dated June 25, 2014 indicates that there are ongoing complaints of headaches. These headaches are treated with medication. There are also complaints of neck pain, low back pain, depression, anxiety, ringing in the ears and decreased concentration. The physical examination was not completed. Diagnostic imaging studies were not presented. Previous treatment includes medications for headache, and multiple clinical evaluations. A request had been made for pulmonary and cardiac testing and was not certified in the pre-authorization process on August 6, 2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

PULMONARY TREADMILL: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
[HTTP://WWW.NCBI.NIM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC3229853](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3229853)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG): Fitness for duty chapter, updated September 2014

Decision rationale: When noting the reported mechanism of injury, exposure congestive, with no data that suggest that there was any ingestion of this foreign substance, and by the parameters noted in the Official Disability Guidelines (ACOEM and MTUS do not address), there is no clinical indication for pulmonary function testing at this time. There simply is no data presented that there is any compromise to the respiratory treatment in the last several months. Therefore, based on the limited clinical rationale presented for review, this is not medically necessary.

PULMONARY FUNCTION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
[HTTP://WWW.NCBI.NIM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG): Fitness for duty chapter, updated September 2014

Decision rationale: When noting the reported mechanism of injury, exposure congestive, with no data that suggest that there was any ingestion of this foreign substance, and by the parameters noted in the Official Disability Guidelines (ACOEM and MTUS do not address), there is no clinical indication for pulmonary function testing at this time. There simply is no data presented that there is any compromise to the respiratory treatment in the last several months. Therefore, based on the limited clinical rationale presented for review, this is not medically necessary.

OXYMETRY: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
[HTTP://WWW.NCBI.NIM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC137227](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc137227)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG): Fitness for duty chapter, updated September 2014

Decision rationale: When noting the reported mechanism of injury, exposure congestive, with no data that suggests that there was any ingestion of this foreign substance, and by the parameters noted in the Official Disability Guidelines (ACOEM and MTUS do not address), there is no clinical indication for pulmonary function testing at this time. There simply is no data presented that there is any compromise of the respiratory treatment in the last several months. Therefore, based on the limited clinical rationale presented for review, this is not medically necessary.

BRONCHODILATION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
[HTTP://WWW.NCBI.NIM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG): Fitness for duty chapter, updated September 2014

Decision rationale: When noting the reported mechanism of injury, exposure congestive, with no data that suggests that there was any ingestion of this foreign substance, and by the parameters noted in the Official Disability Guidelines (ACOEM and MTUS do not address), there is no clinical indication for pulmonary function testing at this time. There simply is no data presented that there is any compromise of the respiratory treatment in the last several months. Therefore, based on the limited clinical rationale presented for review, this is not medically necessary.

METHACHOLINE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
[HTTP://WWW.NCBI.NIM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG): Fitness for duty chapter, updated September 2014

Decision rationale: When noting the reported mechanism of injury, exposure congestive, with no data that suggests that there was any ingestion of this foreign substance, and by the parameters noted in the Official Disability Guidelines (ACOEM and MTUS do not address), there is no clinical indication for pulmonary function testing at this time. There simply is no data presented that there is any compromise to the respiratory treatment in the last several months. Therefore, based on the limited clinical rationale presented for review, this is not medically necessary.

CARDIAC TREADMILL: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
[HTTP://WWW.NCBI.NIM.NIH.GOV/PMC/ARTICLES/PMC](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) cardiac arrhythmias updated September, 2014

Decision rationale: The progress notes, presented for review, indicate complaints of anxiety. There is no data to suggest cardiac complaints. Furthermore, when noting the treatment

plan parameters outlined in the ODG (MTUS and ACOEM do not address), there is no medical necessity established for this procedure. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.