

Case Number:	CM14-0034769		
Date Assigned:	06/20/2014	Date of Injury:	06/15/2012
Decision Date:	07/22/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/16/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/20/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Management 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:

This is a male patient with the date of injury of June 15, 2012. An evaluation dated December 23, 2013 identifies subjective complaints of lower back pain. Physical examination identifies blood pressure of 140/86. Diagnoses identify lower back pain and increased blood pressure (rule out hypertension). The treatment plan identifies chiropractic care and Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One home blood pressure monitor: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation The 2013 Canadian Hypertension Education Program Recommendations for Blood Pressure Measurement, Diagnosis, Assessment of Risk, Prevention, and Treatment Of Hypertension.

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 2013 Canadian Hypertension Education Program recommendations for blood pressure measurement, diagnosis, assessment of risk, prevention, and treatment of hypertension.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for one home blood pressure monitor, California MTUS and ODG do not address the issue. Guidelines state the use of HBPM on a regular basis

should be considered for patients with hypertension, particularly those with: Diabetes mellitus, CKD, suspected non-adherence, demonstrated white coat effect, and BP controlled in the office but not at home (masked hypertension). Within the documentation made available for review, blood pressure was noted to be high on the December 23, 2013 evaluation. However, guidelines recommend home blood pressure monitoring for diabetes mellitus, CKD, suspected non-adherence, demonstrated white coat effect, and BP controlled in the office but not at home. There is no mention of any of these issues in the documentation provided. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested home blood pressure monitor is not medically necessary.