

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0169311		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/17/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/16/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/19/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/13/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/13/2014

### 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 Occupational 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:

There were 602 pages for this review. The application for independent medical review was signed on October 13, 2014. It was for several hepatic blood tests and also for HIV testing. Per the records provided, the patient was injured on July 16, 2013. She was in a freezer and moved boxes and fell. The right foot was injured. She is total temporarily disabled. As of September 24, 2014, she complained of right ankle and foot pain with numbness and aching. The visual analog scale pain was nine out of 10. She walks with a cam walker. She came into the doctor's office on September 24, 2014 using a wheelchair and was unable to walk. The range of motion was decreased by 95% in all directions. They planned a lumbar sympathetic nerve block. Oddly, there was no rationale however explaining how the results of the liver blood tests and HIV would affect the treatment of the claimant's work injury related to the right foot. The medical necessity for these tests was not established. Other notes described she is a 41-year-old female. Prior history involved certification of an MRI of the right ankle, physical therapy, and an ankle foot orthosis was non-certified. The patient can heel toe walk with ease. A custom foot brace did not seem indicated. There were prior epidural steroid injections and therapy for the right foot chronic regional pain syndrome. There is mention in a podiatric exam from September 6, 2013 that she had a cellulitis. They requested physical therapy for that. There is significant tenderness in the foot. Several physical therapy notes were provided and reviewed. Medicines included Acetaminophen Codeine Phosphate, Acetaminophen Hydrocodone Bitartrate, Cephalexin and Cyclobenzaprine. I scanned the available records and again found no particular reason why hepatitis screening and HIV was clinically necessary.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Hep C antibody test: 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: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; there are no signs or symptoms or history of hepatitis C. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Hep B surface antigen test: 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: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; there is no mention of hepatitis B, signs, symptoms or complaints. The clinical necessity for the test is not established. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**HIV 1/2 Ab SCR with RFLS: 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: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; there is no mention of blood borne pathogen exposure, or why an HIV test is needed. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriate under the medical sources reviewed.

**Hep A titer antigen test:** 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: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>

**Decision rationale:** As shared previously, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; there is no mention of liver dysfunction. There is no specification as to the specific tests that would be conducted, and why. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriate under the medical sources reviewed.

**Comprehensive metabolic panel:** 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: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>

**Decision rationale:** Again, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose

diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; further there is mention as to why a metabolic panel is needed. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is not medically necessary and appropriate under the medical sources reviewed.