

Case Number:	CM14-0010800		
Date Assigned:	02/21/2014	Date of Injury:	05/20/2005
Decision Date:	07/09/2014	UR Denial Date:	01/10/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/27/2014

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 Orthopedic Surgery and is licensed to practice in Pennsylvania. 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:

This is a 58-year-old female who was injured in a work related accident 05/20/05. Records for review include a recent utilization review process that certified the role of a surgical procedure to include operative arthroscopy, labral repair, debridement, biceps tenodesis, chondroplasty and subacromial decompression. Also supported at that time was preoperative medical clearance to include electrocardiogram, blood work and a urinalysis. Without documentation of further information, there is a current request for "medical clearance" for this individual.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MEDICAL CLEARANCE: 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 American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004), Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

Decision rationale: Based on California ACOEM Guidelines, the role of "medical clearance" would not be indicated. Records indicate that the claimant has already been certified for

preoperative laboratory testing as well as electrocardiogram and urinalysis. There would currently be no indication for further "clearance" in addition to measures that have already been supported. Therefore, the request for medical clearance is not medically necessary and appropriate.