MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0152002		
Date Assigned:	09/22/2014	Date of Injury:	11/17/2008
Decision Date:	10/24/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/17/2014

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 Family 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 patient is a 43-year-old female who has submitted a claim for lumbosacral neuritis NOS associated with an industrial injury date of November 17, 2008.Medical records from 2014 were reviewed, which showed that the patient complained of back pain. Examination revealed muscle strength in her lower extremity muscles as follows (right/left): hip flexion 5-/4+, knee extension 5-/5, knee flexion 5/5, ankle dorsal flexion 2+/4-, and ankle plant flexion 1/3. Sensory exam revealed decreased sensation to pin prick below the knee and posterior thigh.Treatment to date has included pool therapy, medications, psychotherapy, spinal cord stimulator, injection to right shoulder and lumbar decompression. The patient also has a Fentanyl patch and Tegaderm is being used to cover the Fentanyl patch.Utilization review from August 14, 2014 denied the request for Purchase of 2 boxes of Tegaderm Purchase of 1 box of Tegarderm because there was no documentation of the patches following off or other indications to warrant authorization for occlusive dressings.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Purchase of 2 boxes of Tegaderm: 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: Management of Superficial to Partial-Thickness Wounds, J Athl Train (2007) Jul-Sep; 42(3): 422-424

Decision rationale: CA MTUS and ODG do not specifically address this issue. Per the Strength of Evidence hierarchy established by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Workers' Compensation, an article from PubMed entitled: "Management of Superficial to Partial-Thickness Wounds" was used instead. It states that transparent film dressings, such as Tegaderm, decreased days to complete healing and infection rates compared with nonmoist dressings. In this case, the patient has no wound and the rationale given for this request is to cover the Fentanyl patch in place. A search of online resources does not identify that Tegaderm film is a required adjunct when using Fentanyl patch, as ordinary first-aid tapes may be used instead. The medical necessity has not been established. Therefore, the request for prescription for Purchase of 2 boxes of Tegaderm is not medically necessary.

Purchase of 1 box of Tegarderm: 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: Management of Superficial to Partial-Thickness Wounds, J Athl Train (2007) Jul-Sep; 42(3): 422-424

Decision rationale: CA MTUS and ODG do not specifically address this issue. Per the Strength of Evidence hierarchy established by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Workers' Compensation, an article from PubMed entitled: "Management of Superficial to Partial-Thickness Wounds" was used instead. It states that transparent film dressings, such as Tegaderm, decreased days to complete healing and infection rates compared with nonmoist dressings. In this case, the patient has no wound and the rationale given for this request is to cover the Fentanyl patch in place. A search of online resources does not identify that Tegaderm film is a required adjunct when using Fentanyl patch, as ordinary first-aid tapes may be used instead. The medical necessity has not been established. Therefore, the request for prescription for Purchase of 1 box of Tegaderm is not medically necessary.