

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0103475		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/08/1998
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/27/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/07/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/29/2015

### 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: California, Indiana, Oregon  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

### 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 71 year old female with a September 8, 1998 date of injury. A progress note dated April 29, 2015 documents subjective findings (intractable shoulder pain; bilateral hand pain), and current diagnoses (right shoulder arthritis; bilateral impingement syndrome; cubital tunnel syndrome; bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome). Objective findings were not documented in the medical record submitted for review. Treatments to date have included medications, modified activity level, right shoulder surgery, and x-rays of the right shoulder (showed changes compatible with acromioplasty with slight residual down sloping, acromioclavicular joint degenerative joint disease, with acromioclavicular joint spurring and cystic changes). The treating physician documented a plan of care that included right shoulder revisions arthroscopy with acromioplasty with distal claviclectomy, with associated surgical services and equipment.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Right Shoulder Revisions Arthroscopy with Acromioplasty with Distal Claviclectomy:**  
 Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) shoulder.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on this issue of shoulder replacement. According to the ODG Shoulder section, arthroplasty, "The most common indication for total shoulder arthroplasty is osteoarthritis, but for hemiarthroplasty it is acute fracture. There was a high rate of satisfactory or excellent results after total shoulder arthroplasty for osteoarthritis, but hemiarthroplasty offered less satisfactory results, most likely related to the use of this procedure for trauma." Shoulder arthroplasty is indicated for glenohumeral and acromioclavicular osteoarthritis with severe pain with positive radiographic findings and failure of 6 months of conservative care. In this case, there are no objective findings submitted for review. The imaging reports are not available to detail the level of arthritis. Based on this the request is not medically necessary.

**Pain Pump purchase:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Cold Therapy Unit purchase:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**CPM unit rental x 21 days:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Abduction Brace purchase:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Post-Operative Physical Therapy (12 session) right shoulder:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.