

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0135542		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/29/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/02/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/29/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/18/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/22/2014

### 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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 injured worker is a 65 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/02/2007. On provider visit dated 08/13/2014 the injured worker has reported shoulder, back and right hand pain. On examination of the injured worker was noted to have a slow gait, and mild tenders to palpation was noted at the elbows and knees. The diagnoses have included chronic pain. Treatment to date has included medication and surgical intervention. The provider requested continued pain management office follow-up visits times.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Continued pain management office follow-up visits times 6:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Guidelines, Chapter 7, Page 127.

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

**Decision rationale:** Guidelines state office visits and follow-ups are determined to be medically necessary and play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and treatment based on the patient's concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability along with monitoring of medications including opiates. Determination of necessity requires individualized case review and assessment with focus on return to function of the injured worker. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated acute symptoms or red flag conditions and clinical findings to allow for continued arbitrary follow-up intervention and care and future care with multiple visits cannot be pre-determined as assessment should be made according to presentation and clinical appropriateness. The patient continues to treat for chronic symptoms without any acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration to predict future outcome; Undetermined quantity of follow-up visits is not medically indicated for this chronic injury. The Continued pain management office follow-up visits times 6 is not medically necessary and appropriate.