

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0071000		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/14/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/20/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/22/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/25/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/16/2014

### 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 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 52-year-old female with a 12/20/07 date of injury. At the time (4/25/14) of the decision for stress test, there is documentation of subjective complaints of low back pain radiating down the legs and objective findings of decreased lumbar range of motion with pain. Current diagnosis is lumbar sprain and treatment to date has consisted of medications, injections, and chiropractic therapy. There is no documentation that the patient has known or suspected coronary heart disease; and the intended stress testing modality (exercise electrocardiography; exercise or pharmacologic stress combined with imaging (stress echocardiography and stress radionuclide myocardial perfusion imaging [MPI])) to be used for the requested stress test.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Stress Test:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACC/AHA 2007 Guidelines, <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/116/17/e418>.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation (<http://www.uptodate.com/contents/selecting-the-optimal-cardiac-stress-test>).

**Decision rationale:** MTUS and ODG do not address this issue. Medical Treatment Guideline identifies that Cardiac stress testing is an important diagnostic and prognostic tool in the evaluation and management of patients with known or suspected coronary heart disease; and that the most commonly used and widely available stress testing modalities are exercise electrocardiography (ECG; non-imaging) and exercise or pharmacologic stress combined with imaging (stress echocardiography and stress radionuclide myocardial perfusion imaging [MPI]). Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of a diagnosis of lumbar sprain. However, there is no documentation that the patient has known or suspected coronary heart disease. In addition, there is no documentation of the intended stress testing modality (exercise electrocardiography; exercise or pharmacologic stress combined with imaging (stress echocardiography and stress radionuclide myocardial perfusion imaging [MPI])) to be used for the requested stress test. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for stress test is not medically necessary.