

Case Number:	CM14-0033532		
Date Assigned:	06/20/2014	Date of Injury:	06/24/2010
Decision Date:	10/14/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/12/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/17/2014

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 General Surgery, and is licensed to practice in Texas. 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 48 year old male with a reported date of injury on 6/24/2010. The claimant sustained multiple injuries from the industrial event. The claimant has undergone extensive imaging and has multiple residual complaints. There are complaints of urinary incontinence, impotence and decreased libido. There is a request for referral to a General Surgeon for evaluation and treatment of pain about bilateral groin areas with radiation to the testicles.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Referral to General Surgeon: 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 American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Independent Medical Examinations & Consultations, page(s) 127

Decision rationale: The claimant suffered multiple injuries. There are persistent complaints of bilateral groin pain with testicular pain, incontinence, impotence and decreased libido. These

complaints are best evaluated by an Urologist. Referral to a general surgeon is not medically necessary and remains not medically necessary.