MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0200007		
Date Assigned:	12/10/2014	Date of Injury:	06/01/2001
Decision Date:	01/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/31/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/01/2014

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 Psychiatry and is licensed to practice in Illinois and Wisconsin. 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:

This is a 64 year old female who was injured in June of 2001. The patient has a diagnosis of Major Depressive Disorder and is on Nortriptyline and Zoloft. There is essentially no clinical information available for review. The provider is requesting coverage for a BDI, Psychotherapy and a BAI. Coverage for the BAI (Beck's Anxiety Inventory) was denied by the previous reviewer due to lack of medical necessity. This is an independent review for medical necessity for the requested BAI.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Beck anxiety inventory: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 15 Stress Related Conditions.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Ovsanna T. Leyfer *, Joshua L. Ruberg, Janet Woodruff-Borden, Examination of the utility of the Beck Anxiety Inventory and its factors as a screener for anxiety disorders, Anxiety Disorders 20 (2006) 444-458

Decision rationale: ACOEM, State of California MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of the BAI. This test appears to have some utility as a screening tool for panic disorder as noted in the above cited reference but its usefulness is otherwise somewhat limited. In this case there is limited clinical information and a rationale for the request for this test is not apparent in the record review. As such medical necessity for the BAI is not established by the limited clinical information submitted for review.