

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0142981		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/10/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/09/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/04/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/03/2014

### 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: New York, Pennsylvania, Washington  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Geriatric Medicine

### 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 47 year old, male, who sustained a work related injury on 12/9/11. The diagnoses have included hypertension, hyperlipidemia and blurred vision. Treatment has included medications. In the PR-2 dated 7/2/14, the injured worker has regular heart rate and rhythm. No abnormal sounds are noted. No cyanosis or edema is noted. Vital signs at this visit are B/P 135/97 and heart rate is 60. The treatment plan is ordering a 2 D ECHO and carotid ultrasound.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**2D Echocardiography with doppler:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Clinical Application of Echocardiography Yr. published:2003, ACC/AHA Practice Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation

ACCF/ASE/AHA/ASNC/HFSA/HRS/SCAI/SCCM/SCCT/SCMR 2011 Appropriate Use Criteria for Echocardiography <http://content.onlinejacc.org/article.aspx?articleid=1144231>.

**Decision rationale:** This 42 year old injured worker has a history of hypertension and hyperlipidemia. His hypertension is well controlled and he has a normal cardiac and respiratory exam and is asymptomatic. Per the ACCF/ASE/AHA/ASNC/HFSA/HRS/SCAI/SCCM/SCCT/SCMR 2011 Appropriate Use Criteria for Echocardiography Guidelines, he has a low global CAD risk based upon her age, sex and being asymptomatic of cardiac symptoms. This is a 10-year absolute CAD risk of < 6-10%. The records do not support the medical necessity of an echocardiogram /ultrasound in this individual. Therefore, the requested medical treatment is not medically necessary.

**Carotid Ultrasound:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation RadiologyInfo.org at <http://www.radiologyinfo.org/en/info.cfm?>.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation uptodate: Screening for asymptomatic carotid artery stenosis.

**Decision rationale:** This 42 year old injured worker has a history of hypertension and hyperlipidemia. His hypertension is well controlled and he has a normal cardiac and respiratory exam and is asymptomatic. Screening for carotid artery stenosis can be done by auscultation for carotid bruits during physical examination or by noninvasive studies of the carotid artery, such as carotid ultrasound. The records do not document a carotid exam nor presence or absence of bruits. There is no prior history of CVA or TIA. The records do not support the medical necessity of a carotid ultrasound in this individual. Therefore, the requested medical treatment is not medically necessary.