

Case Number:	CM14-0056573		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2014	Date of Injury:	07/12/2012
Decision Date:	09/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	03/25/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/25/2014

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 Ophthalmology 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:

The patient is a 46-year-old with a date of injury of July 12, 2012 with history of cervical, thoracic, lumbar, bilateral shoulder, bilateral elbow, bilateral wrist, and bilateral knee pain. The patient complains of blurred vision attributed to degreaser per report on August 22, 2012. No visual acuity or any eye examination is documented.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ophthalmology Consultation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM 2004 OMPG, Chapter 7: Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations. (page 127).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Chapter 7: Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, Page 127.

Decision rationale: There is no visual acuity, eye examination, or additional history provided to indicate a significant ophthalmological condition is present for which Ophthalmology Consultation would be medically necessary. Therefore, the request for an ophthalmology consultation is not medically necessary or appropriate.

