

Case Number:	CM14-0201164		
Date Assigned:	12/11/2014	Date of Injury:	04/09/2014
Decision Date:	01/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/10/2014
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 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:

The applicant is a represented [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for wrist pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of April 9, 2014. In a Utilization Review Report dated November 10, 2014, the claims administrator denied a request for a Vascutherm DVT compression device rental for four weeks. The device in question was apparently dispensed on November 4, 2014, the claims administrator contended. Non-MTUS Aetna Guidelines were invoked. On November 4, 2014, the attending provider ordered a Vascutherm device with associated DVT wraps. Little to no narrative commentary was provided beyond the RFA form. On September 11, 2014, the attending provider sought authorization for an ulnar neuroplasty and carpal tunnel release surgery. Tramadol was endorsed for postoperative purposes. The applicant's past medical history was not clearly detailed. In a July 15, 2014 progress note, it was stated that the applicant was working regular duty as of that point in time. The applicant's past medical history was notable only for hypertension. The applicant had had no previous surgeries, it was stated at that point in time. The attending provider suggested that the applicant was in the process of pursuing an exploratory wrist surgery/wrist arthroscopy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Vascutherm rental with purchase of wrist garment: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Aetna medical policy #0500, intermittent pneumatic compression devices

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation British Society for Surgery of the Hand, Venous Thromboembolism Guidelines.

Decision rationale: The request in question appears to represent a request for postoperative DVT prophylaxis following planned carpal tunnel release surgery. The MTUS does not address the topic. As noted by the British Society for Surgery of the Hand (BSSH), risk factors for thrombosis include a lengthier procedure, age greater than 60, a personal history of venous thromboembolism, obesity, known thrombophilias, and/or active cancer or cancer treatment. Here, the applicant had no known history of previous thrombophilias. The applicant had no clearly stated or clearly established familial history of thrombophilia. The applicant's only known risk factor for DVT, thus, was age (62). However, the British Society for Surgery of the Hand (BSSH) notes that an upper limb procedure under general anesthesia of less than 90 minutes duration, without risk factors requires no prophylaxis. The planned carpal tunnel release surgery here was, by all accounts, a lower-risk procedure. The applicant had only one risk factor. Provision of DVT prophylaxis via the Vascutherm rental and associated wrist garment was not, thus, indicated. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.