

Case Number:	CM15-0103936		
Date Assigned:	06/12/2015	Date of Injury:	11/05/2013
Decision Date:	09/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	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
 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:

The injured worker is a 37 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/05/2013. Diagnoses include right shoulder labral tear causing popping, catching, swelling and decreased range of motion. Treatment to date has included conservative care including multiple subacromial injections as well as physical therapy. Per the Secondary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 4/22/2015, the injured worker reported left shoulder pain with popping and catching. Physical examination revealed decreased range of motion and painful range of motion of the shoulder with popping and catching. There was positive impingement with some rotator cuff weakness. The plan of care included surgical intervention and authorization was requested for an assistant surgeon, cold treatment unit - ice machine, Oxycontin 20mg, Percocet 5/325mg, postoperative physical therapy (2x6) for the right shoulder, pre-op evaluation with internal medicine, right shoulder arthroscopy and posterior labral repair with subacromial decompression and mini Mumford and an ultra-sling for post-op use.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right shoulder arthroscopy, posterior labral repair with subacromial decompression and mini-Munford: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 209-211. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Shoulder Chapter, Surgery for SLAP lesions, Surgery for shoulder dislocation-Partial claviclectomy (Mumford procedure).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 209-210. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Shoulder labral tear surgery.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM Shoulder Chapter, page 209-210, surgical considerations for the shoulder include failure of four months of activity modification and existence of a surgical lesion. In addition the guidelines recommend surgery consideration for a clear clinical and imaging evidence of a lesion shown to benefit from surgical repair. According to ODG, Shoulder, labral tear surgery, it is recommended for Type II lesions and for Type IV lesions if more than 50% of the tendon is involved. See SLAP lesion diagnosis. There is insufficient evidence from the exam note of 4/22/15 to warrant labral repair secondary to lack of physical examination findings, lack of documentation of conservative care or characterization of Type II or IV labral tear. Therefore determination is not medically necessary.

Assistant surgeon: 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.

Inpatient hospital stay (length of stay unknown): 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.

Preoperative evaluation with internal medicine: 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, twice a week for six weeks: 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 Ultrasling: 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.

Associated Surgical Service: Cold therapy unit (ice machine): 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.

Oxycontin 20mg #20: 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.

Percocet 5/325mg #60: 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.