

Case Number:	CM14-0075382		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2014	Date of Injury:	03/30/2012
Decision Date:	09/16/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/23/2014

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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 47-year-old male with a 3/30/12 date of injury. At the time (3/19/14) of request for authorization for Power scooter for community mobility, there is documentation of subjective (right knee pain and left upper extremity uncontrolled spasms) and objective (spastic and myoclonic left upper extremity, left knee brace noted, positive right meniscal signs, tenderness over the right medial joint line, and failed single right leg stance) findings, current diagnoses (incomplete spinal cord injury with tetraparesis, C2 non-displaced fracture with subsequent spinal cord injury and brown-Sequard like syndrome, myoclonus/spasticity, meniscal tear of the left knee with repair, and meniscal tear of the right knee), and treatment to date (medications and physical therapy). There is no documentation that there is no caregiver who is available, willing, or able to provide assistance with a manual wheelchair.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Power scooter for community mobility: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Power mobility devices (PMDs) Page(s): 99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Knee and Leg, Walking Aids.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Power Mobility Devices Page(s): 132.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of a functional mobility deficit that cannot be sufficiently resolved by the prescription of a cane or walker, the patient has insufficient upper extremity function to propel a manual wheelchair, and there is no caregiver who is available, willing, or able to provide assistance with a manual wheelchair, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of Motorized Wheelchair or Scooter. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of incomplete spinal cord injury with tetraparesis, C2 non-displaced fracture with subsequent spinal cord injury and brown-Sequard like syndrome, myoclonus/spasticity, meniscal tear of the left knee with repair, and meniscal tear of the right knee. In addition, given documentation of subjective (left upper extremity uncontrolled spasms) and objective (spastic and myoclonic left upper extremity, left knee brace noted, positive right meniscal signs, tenderness over the right medial joint line, and failed single right leg stance) findings, there is documentation of a functional mobility deficit that cannot be sufficiently resolved by the prescription of a cane or walker and insufficient upper extremity function to propel a manual wheelchair. However, there is no documentation that there is no caregiver who is available, willing, or able to provide assistance with a manual wheelchair. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Power scooter for community mobility is not medically necessary.