

Case Number:	CM14-0111261		
Date Assigned:	08/01/2014	Date of Injury:	04/25/2001
Decision Date:	09/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	06/16/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/16/2014

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 Internal Medicine, 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:

The injured worker is a 42 year-old female with an industrial injury on April 25, 2001. The mechanism of injury is not described. She has had spine and shoulder surgery as of 2002 without benefit. Symptoms included chronic back pain and chronic shoulder pain. The injured worker has had episodes of "flare ups" of pain. The injured worker has one child and the route of delivery is not mentioned. The patient has experienced incontinence of urine with coughing, laughing and sneezing in the past year. The request is for a urology consultation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Urology consultation for incontinence: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 127.

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; American Urological Association 2012 Guidelines on Urodynamics and the 2009 guideline (updated in 2012) on Female Stress Urinary Incontinence.

Decision rationale: The patient's symptoms are consistent with stress urinary incontinence. In middle aged women who have had children, as the injured has, there is often concomitant pelvic organ prolapse due to pelvic floor weakness. Often, stress incontinence is accompanied by other

forms of incontinence such as urge incontinence due to detrusor instability or over activity. Neurological problems can lead to atonic bladder and complicate the picture. There is no evidence of a neurological problem in the injured workers case. However, she could certainly have a mixed type of incontinence with urge and stress both. As such, urodynamic assessment and urological evaluation is considered medically necessary.