

Case Number:	CM15-0103060		
Date Assigned:	06/05/2015	Date of Injury:	11/21/2014
Decision Date:	07/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/28/2015

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: North Carolina
Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 45 year old female injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 11/21/2014. The diagnoses included face contusion, right shoulder strain/sprain and right wrist strain/sprain. The diagnostics included right wrist/hand magnetic resonance imaging. The injured worker had been treated with physical therapy. On 4/23/2015 the treating provider reported continued right shoulder pain, right wrist pain and vision changes. On exam, the right shoulder had tenderness with restricted range of motion with positive impingement signs. The right wrist was tender. The treatment plan included Ophthalmology Consultation, MRI of the right shoulder and EMG/NCV of upper extremities.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ophthalmology Consultation: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Chapter 7: Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment.

Decision rationale: Per the ACOEM : The health practitioner may refer to other specialist if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for 1. Consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability. The patient has complaint of visual changes and therefore an ophthalmology consult is medically warranted and the request is medically necessary.

MRI of the right shoulder: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), MRI Shoulder.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on shoulder complaints and imaging studies states: Primary criteria for ordering imaging studies are: "Emergence of a red flag (e.g., indications of intra-abdominal or cardiac problems presenting as shoulder problems). Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurovascular dysfunction (e.g., cervical root problems presenting as shoulder pain, weakness from a massive rotator cuff tear, or the presence of edema, cyanosis or Raynaud's phenomenon). Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery." Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure (e.g., a full thickness rotator cuff tear not responding to conservative treatment). The criteria as set forth above for imaging studies of the shoulder have not been met from review of the provided clinical documentation. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

EMG/NCV of upper extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 261. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck and Upper Back Chapter, Electromyography (EMG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173-174.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag, Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery, Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electrodiagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient

evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks. The assessment may include sensory-evoked potentials (SEPs) if spinal stenosis or spinal cord myelopathy is suspected. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding next steps, including the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Additional studies may be considered to further define problem areas. The recent evidence indicates cervical disk annular tears may be missed on MRIs. The clinical significance of such a finding is unclear, as it may not correlate temporally or anatomically with symptoms. The provided documentation does not show any signs of emergence of red flags or physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no mention of planned invasive procedures. There are no subtle neurologic findings listed on the physical exam. For these reasons criteria for special diagnostic testing has not been met per the ACOEM. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.