

Case Number:	CM14-0161740		
Date Assigned:	10/07/2014	Date of Injury:	08/28/2009
Decision Date:	11/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/16/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/01/2014

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 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:

55-year-old male with reported industrial injury of August 28, 2009. [REDACTED] is status post left knee surgery. exam note August 12, 2014 demonstrates the patient is status Post Left Knee Surgery performed 3 weeks ago. it is noted that the patient had an ultrasound demonstrating no signs of deep vein thrombosis. blood pressures noted to be 146/90. Exam note September 9, 2014 demonstrates no signs or symptoms of infection. the patient's blood pressure is noted to be 164/97. Requesting physician recommends a hemodynamic study.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hemodynamic Study: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation www.loyolamedicine.org

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: The Multimodal Concept of Hemodynamic Stabilization. Front Public Health

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of hemodynamic study. ODG is also silent on Hemodynamic Study. External sources were utilized. According to Tanczos et al, in 2014 states that a balance between oxygen delivery and consumption gives a detailed picture

about the hemodynamic status of patients. In this case while the exam notes demonstrate hypertension there is no rationale why a hemodynamic study is indicated. Therefore the determination is for not medically necessary.