

Case Number:	CM15-0018044		
Date Assigned:	02/05/2015	Date of Injury:	04/03/2004
Decision Date:	05/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/30/2015

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: New Jersey
 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 injured worker is a 52-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 4/3/04. He complains of migraine episodes 3 to 4 times a week and neck pain that radiates to his shoulders. Medications include Zoloft, Depakote, Ambien, amitriptyline, gabapentin and Neurontin. Diagnoses are chronic posttraumatic headache, mixed headaches with migraine headaches, migraine transformation including tension headaches; posttraumatic stress disorder; traumatic facial injury with reconstructive surgery and right eye enucleation and B12 deficiency. There was no documentation regarding replacement glasses. On 1/15/15 Utilization Review non-certified, the request for 2 pair of replacement glasses (lenses and Frames): 1 untinted; and 1 sunglasses citing ODG, ODG web Eye- Office Visits.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One pair of untinted glasses with lenses and frames: 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), Eye, Office visits.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Eye section, Office visits.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines do not address prescription glasses replacement. The ODG does discuss that frequency of office visits and the associated eye examination may be needed every 1-2 years depending on the condition and age of the patient, but also does not address prescription glasses replacements. In the case of this worker, he was provided new untinted glasses with lenses and frames about one year prior to this request, reportedly in the notes. There was no information provided in the notes to explain why this worker requires new untinted glasses this quickly. Therefore, the request for the one pair of untinted glasses with lenses and frames will be considered medically unnecessary at this time due to the lack of supportive information to justify this request.

One pair of sunglasses with lenses and frames: 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), Eye, Office visits.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Eye section, Office visits.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines do not address prescription glasses replacement. The ODG does discuss that frequency of office visits and the associated eye examination may be needed every 1-2 years depending on the condition and age of the patient, but also does not address prescription glasses replacements. In the case of this worker, he was provided new sunglasses with lenses and frames about one year prior to this request, reportedly in the notes. There was no information provided in the notes to explain why this worker requires new sunglasses this quickly. Therefore, the request for the one pair of sunglasses with lenses and frames will be considered medically unnecessary at this time due to the lack of supportive information to justify this request.