

Case Number:	CM14-0089490		
Date Assigned:	06/20/2014	Date of Injury:	07/23/2008
Decision Date:	08/15/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/23/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/13/2014

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 64 year-old male with the diagnoses of oculomotor dysfunction, visual spatial disorientation, and photosensitivity, for whom request is made for office visit, extended ophthalmoscopy, fundus photos, optical coherence tomography, and 3 pairs of eyeglasses (prescription, reading, and prescription sunglasses). Per exam dated 3/28/2014, the patient is status post blunt head trauma on 7/23/2008, and complains of vertigo, balance problems, and nausea. The patient lost his distance prescription glasses. The patient reports that the glasses helped with ambulation. Visual acuity unaided is 20/60 right eye (OD) and 20/30 left eye (OS) at distance, and 20/200 at near. Best corrected visual acuity with refraction is 20/20 OD and 20/25 OS, and 20/20 both eyes (OU) at near with +2.00 add. Exam is unremarkable. Fundus exam, and optic nerve cup/disc ratio is not documented. Intraocular pressure is not documented. Prior visual field findings are not documented.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Office Visit, VF: 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 Refractive Errors & Refractive Surgery PPP - 2013, American Academy of Ophthalmology. Also see other guidelines cited below for other requests.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not provide direction for eye care for this condition. An alternative, evidence-based guideline was used from the American Academy of Ophthalmology. Refraction was completed on 3/28/2014. Another office visit was stated to be necessary for further testing (the tests listed in the requests below). As these tests are not medically necessary, an office visit for that purpose is not medically necessary. Please refer to the following requests and decisions for the specific reasoning and guidelines.

Extend Ophthalmoscopy: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24391370> Oman J Ophthalmol. 2013 Sep;6(Suppl 1):S32-5. doi: 10.4103/0974-620X.122292. Imaging of the peripheral retina. Kernt M, Kampik A.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not provide direction for eye care for this condition. An alternative, evidence-based guideline was used from the American Academy of Ophthalmology. There is no documentation that the patient has a peripheral retinal lesion or pathology that requires extended ophthalmoscopy. The guidelines cited recommend extended ophthalmoscopy for specific retinal pathology which was not described by the treating physician. Absent those specific indications, the extended ophthalmoscopy is not medically necessary.

Fundus Photo, OCT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM, Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American Academy of Ophthalmology (AAO) - Preferred Practice Patterns - Glaucoma suspect 2010 <http://one.aao.org/preferred-practice-pattern/primary-openangle-glaucoma-suspect-ppp--october-20>.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not provide direction for eye care for this condition. An alternative, evidence-based guideline was used from the American Academy of Ophthalmology. There is no documentation that the patient is a glaucoma suspect. There is no optic disc cupping or intraocular pressure documented in the progress note submitted for review, as would be necessary per the cited guideline. The treating physician has not provided the specific indications for the fundus photo. The fundus photo is not medically necessary based on the lack of sufficient indications per the cited guideline and the available medical reports.

1 pair of Prescription Eye Glasses: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Refractive Errors & Refractive Surgery PPP - 2013, American Academy of Ophthalmology.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not provide direction for eye care for this condition. An alternative, evidence-based guideline was used from the American Academy of Ophthalmology. The patient's prior eyeglasses are from 9/2011. The patient lost his eyeglasses. On the most recent followup on 3/28/2014, the patient has a manifest refraction with documented improvement in vision with the eyeglasses. The new prescription eyeglasses are medically necessary in light of the refractive errors and need for a new pair of glasses. The cited guidelines recommend eyeglasses for patients with this degree of refractive error.

1 pair of Prescription Reading Glasses: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Refractive Errors & Refractive Surgery PPP - 2013, American Academy of Ophthalmology.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not provide direction for eye care for this condition. An alternative, evidence-based guideline was used from the American Academy of Ophthalmology. The patient is noted to lose his prescription distance eyeglasses, but not his reading glasses prescribed in 9/2011. There is no documentation that the reading glasses prescription has changed. Although the injured worker has a refractive error and may be a candidate for reading glasses per the cited guidelines, the treating physician has not documented adequate reasons why the prior eyeglasses are not adequate. A new pair of eyeglasses for reading are therefore not medically necessary.

1 pair of Prescription Sunglasses: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Refractive Errors & Refractive Surgery PPP - 2013, American Academy of Ophthalmology.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not provide direction for eye care for this condition. An alternative, evidence-based guideline was used from the American Academy of Ophthalmology. The patient was previously prescribed prescription sunglasses in 9/2011. The injured worker lost his regular prescription glasses (not the sunglasses). There is no information from the treating physician showing why new sunglasses are required compared to ongoing use of the prior sunglasses. Although the injured worker may be a candidate for prescription sunglasses given the

refractive errors and cited guidelines, the treating physician would need to show reasons why the prior prescription is not currently adequate. Based on the currently available information, a new prescription for sunglasses is not medically necessary.