

Case Number:	CM14-0047841		
Date Assigned:	07/02/2014	Date of Injury:	05/27/2010
Decision Date:	08/01/2014	UR Denial Date:	03/19/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/14/2014

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 Internal Medicine and is licensed to practice in New York. 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 claimant is a 31 y.o. male who sustained an industrial injury on 05/27/2010. He was injured while pushing a dolly up a ramp when he felt a “poke” in his ankle. His diagnoses include neck pain, knee pain, bilateral ankle and bilateral foot pain. Therapies have included medications, foot bracing, chiropractic care, shockwave therapy, injections, neurostimulation, and knee bracing. No physical exam abnormalities were noted. An Internal Medicine evaluation with laboratory studies revealed an elevated uric acid to 9.0. The claimant was felt to have a diagnosis of gout requiring medical therapy. The treating provider has requested venipuncture, a urine dip stick and one glucose reagent strip.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One venipuncture: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medline Plus, Urinalysis, Venipuncture.

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: Medscape Internal Medicine 2013: Laboratory studies.

Decision rationale: There was no documentation provided necessitating the venipuncture. The claimant's orthopedic issues were related to a specific injury and there was no specific evidence for any inflammatory process. There were no physical exam findings consistent with gout or any other inflammatory process. Medical necessity for the requested item was not established. The requested item was not medically necessary.

One urine dipstick: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medline Plus, Urinalysis, Venipuncture.

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: Medscape Internal Medicine 2013: Laboratory studies.

Decision rationale: There was no indication for a urinalysis. A urinalysis may be used to check for blood in the urine, urinary tract infection, or evidence of kidney disease. There was no evidence of any renal issue related to the claimant's industrial injury. Medical necessity for the requested item was not established. The requested item was not medically necessary.

One glucose-reagent strip: 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: Medscape Internal Medicine 2013: Laboratory studies.

Decision rationale: There was no indication for the glucose-reagent strip. There was no evidence diabetes related to the claimant's industrial injury. Medical necessity for the requested item was not established. The requested item was not medically necessary.