

Case Number:	CM14-0018970		
Date Assigned:	04/23/2014	Date of Injury:	07/22/2013
Decision Date:	08/07/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/12/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/14/2014

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 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 38-year-old female was reportedly injured on July 22, 2013. There was a February 4, 2014 note indicating the injured employee had requested change of treating provider. The mechanism of injury was noted as a slip and fall type event. The most recent progress note, dated January 14, 2014, indicated that there were ongoing complaints of neck, back and right shoulder pains. The physical examination demonstrated upper and lower extremity deep tendon reflexes to be 2+ and intact bilaterally, a slight decrease to lumbar spine range of motion and a normal cervical spine range of motion. The right shoulder and right ankle also noted to have a full and equal range of motion, and a positive Kemp's test was noted. Diagnostic imaging studies had been completed and were not presented. A request had been made for repeat radiographs and was not certified in the pre-authorization process on February 11, 2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

CERVICAL X-RAY: 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), Online, Radiographs: Cervical.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation.

Decision rationale: The progress note, dated January 14, 2014, clearly indicated that plain films were completed at the [REDACTED], and then no effort had been made to obtain those films. By the x-rays that had been completed and by the physical examination presented, there was no medical necessity to repeat these x-rays at this time.

(R) ANKLE/FOOT X-RAYS: 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), Online, Radiographs: Ankle.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation.

Decision rationale: The progress note, dated January 14, 2014, clearly indicated that plain films were completed at the [REDACTED], and then no effort had been made to obtain those films. By the x-rays that had been completed and by the physical examination presented, there was no medical necessity to repeat these x-rays at this time.

LUMBAR X-RAY: 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), Online, Radiographs: Lumbar.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation.

Decision rationale: The progress note, dated January 14, 2014, clearly indicated that plain films were completed at the [REDACTED], and then no effort has been made to obtain those films. By the x-rays that had been completed and by the physical examination presented, there was no medical necessity to repeat these x-rays at this time.