

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0014754		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/20/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/22/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/12/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/26/2015

### 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: Dentist

### 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 53 year old male, who sustained a work/ industrial injury on 1/22/02. Mechanism of injury was not documented. He has reported symptoms of pain in the lower left side with #19 tooth. Prior history indicted implants of #24 and #25. X-rays indicate no bone loss. The diagnoses have included xerostomia. Diagnostics included a Computed Tomography (CT) that shows prior work done at #2as well as #18, plus mandible bone exposure. The provider noted that a prosthetic replacing #2,#3, and #18 would be less invasive but a large removable prosthetic for a small unilateral space would not be preferable and recommended evaluation for dental implant replacements of #2, #, and #18. Also extraction of teeth #15 and #19 with bone graft, sinus lift, and implant placement. On 1/12/15, Utilization Review non-certified a Sinus lift x 2; IV sedation x 3 and IV sedation x 32 Anatomage guide x 2; Implant x 6; Sinus lift tooth #15; Bone graft socket x 2 Guided tissue x 2; Regeneration, noting the California Medical treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) Guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Sinus lift x 2:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned handwritten progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for sinus lift x2 at this time.

**IV sedation x 3 and IV sedation x 32:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical

conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for IV sedation at this time.

**Anatome guide x 2:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history

and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for Anatomage guide x2 at this time.

#### **Implant x 6: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for Implant x6 at this time.

#### **Sinus tooth life #15: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July

18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for Sinus tooth lift #15 at this time.

**Bone graft socket x 2:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for Bone graft socket x2 at this time.

**Guided tissue x 2:** 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).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for Guided tissue at this time.

**Regeneration:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation ( 9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

**Decision rationale:** In the records reviewed, there is a single page, barely legible, unsigned hand written progress note from the requesting oral surgeon. There are no other legible recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This IMR reviewer does not believe this has been met in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification for regeneration at this time.