

Case Number:	CM15-0132854		
Date Assigned:	07/21/2015	Date of Injury:	08/08/2000
Decision Date:	08/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/09/2015

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, Texas, Florida

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management, Hospice & Palliative Medicine

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 60 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on August 8, 2000. The injured worker reported back and hands and wrists injury. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical and thoracic strain/sprain, lumbar disc rupture, right carpal tunnel syndrome and left status post carpal tunnel. Treatment to date has included surgery, physical therapy and medication. A progress note dated June 9, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of neck, back and wrist pain. Physical exam notes decreased sensitivity of the right leg. There is a request for pain management follow-up.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pain management follow-up visit: 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: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain Chapter, Office visits.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Pain management follow-up visit, California MTUS does not specifically address the issue. ODG cites that the need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self care as soon as clinically feasible. Within the documentation available for review, it is noted that the patient is currently taking multiple medications that warrant routine reevaluation for efficacy and continued need. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Pain management follow-up visit is medically necessary.