MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0074018		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2014	Date of Injury:	09/23/2009
Decision Date:	09/15/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/01/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/21/2014

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 Occupational Medicine 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 claimant was injured on 09/23/09. An Ophthalmology Medical provider Network (MPN) has been requested and is under review. The claimant reportedly sustained an injury to her cervical spine and is status post ACDF in September 2012 at 2 levels. She has also been diagnosed with other medical conditions. An ophthalmology examination was requested but there is no evidence of any eye problems. There is no documentation of diabetes or other conditions that may result in eye complications. An ophthalmology consultation was ordered by [redacted] on 03/21/14 and the diagnoses were Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease (GERD), hypertension with Left Ventricle (LV) enlargement, sleep disorder, peripheral edema due to hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and vitamin D deficiency. The claimant was evaluated on 04/18/14 and stated her blood pressure was stable at home. She had some light headaches after the injury. The fundus was not visualized on examination. An Ophthalmology consultation was to rule out end organ damage due to hypertension. Her blood pressure that day was 133/88. Visual acuity has not been recorded. There is no indication of any eye complaints.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Opthamology MPN: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 92. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG): Eye Chapter. Ophthalmic consultation.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004): Chapter 7, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

Decision rationale: The Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the Non-MTUS American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Chapter 7, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127. The Expert Reviewer's decision rationale:The history and documentation do not objectively support the request for an Ophthalmology consultation. The MTUS state "if a diagnosis is uncertain or complex, if psychosocial factors are present, or if the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise, the occupational health physician may refer a patient to other specialists for an independent medical assessment." In this case, there is no indication given for this type of evaluation. No medical conditions requiring this type of evaluation were described. The claimant reported no eye symptoms and her visual acuity was not recorded. There is no indication that the provider ruled out an equipment malfunction to explain the lack of visualization of the fundus. The medical history lacks any documentation of past or current eye symptoms or disorders. The duration of her hypertension is unknown. The medical necessity of an Ophthalmology consultation has not been clearly demonstrated.