

Case Number:	CM14-0049224		
Date Assigned:	06/25/2014	Date of Injury:	11/19/2013
Decision Date:	07/25/2014	UR Denial Date:	03/19/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/26/2014

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 Dentistry 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 patient (66 years old male) has been involved in an industrial injury on 11/19/2013 where he suffered blunt force trauma to the teeth and face. Notes indicate that teeth 8 and 10 were fractured below the gum and teeth 23 and 26 were also fractured. [REDACTED] DMD is requesting 1 muco-gingival and osseous surgery per application for IMR dated 03/24/2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 muco-gingival and osseous surgery: 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 Non-MTUS HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis & treatment of periodontal diseases, Minneapolis (MN): HealthPartners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 page 37.

Decision rationale: There is no indication/diagnosis or reports of pathology suggesting the need for 1 mucogingival and osseous surgery. Therefore, mucogingival and osseous surgery is NOT medically necessary.