

Case Number:	CM14-0011313		
Date Assigned:	02/21/2014	Date of Injury:	09/17/2000
Decision Date:	07/03/2014	UR Denial Date:	01/20/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/28/2014

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 licensed in Dentistry, 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:

Per UR report dated 1/20/2014, the patient is a 43 year old male with date of injury 9/17/00. The patient has been diagnosed with gingival inflammation and early stage periodontal disease. ■■■■■ is requesting a waterpick/waterflosser ultra.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

WATERPIC / WATERFLOSSER ULTRA: 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: . J Clin Dent. 2005;16(3):71-7 Comparison of irrigation to floss as an adjunct to tooth brushing: effect on bleeding, gingivitis, and supragingival plaque. Barnes CM1, Russell CM, Reinhardt RA, Payne JB, Lyle DM.

Decision rationale: As concluded in the above mentioned citation from PubMed: "The results of this clinical trial indicate that when combined with manual or sonic tooth brushing, oral irrigation is an effective alternative to manual tooth brushing and dental floss for reducing bleeding, gingival inflammation, and plaque removal." Therefore the waterpick is not found to

be more effective than flossing in reducing bleeding, gingival inflammation and plaque removal. It is found to be an acceptable ALTERNATIVE to flossing. The records do not indicate why the patient cannot use a floss, and why a waterpick is recommended over flossing. Waterpick is not a medical necessity at this time.