

Case Number:	CM14-0182902		
Date Assigned:	11/07/2014	Date of Injury:	01/18/2008
Decision Date:	12/12/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/13/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/03/2014

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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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 66-year-old man who sustained a work related injury on January 18, 2008. Subsequently, he developed chronic neck and low back pain. The progress report dated October 2, 2014 was illegible. The provider requested authorization for a follow-up pain medicine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Follow -up pain medicine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Guidelines, 2nd Edition Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations. page 127

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs, early intervention Page(s): 32-33.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, the presence of red flags may indicate the need for specialty consultation. In addition, the requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for an ortho evaluation with a specialist. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. The provider did not give a justification for the follow up visit. There is

no documentation of the reasons, the specific goals and end point for this consultation.
Therefore, the request for Follow-up pain medicine is not medically necessary.