

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0141016		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/30/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/08/1997
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/09/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/20/2015

### 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:

This 50-year-old female sustained an industrial injury on 12-08-97. She subsequently reported foot, back, leg and dental pain. Diagnoses include tooth broken, fractured due to trauma, dental caries and disturbance of salivary secretion. The injured continues to experience dental issues. A request for PFM Crown, Root canal and post as needed; tooth #2, PFM Crown, Root canal and post as needed; tooth #14, PFM Crown, Root canal and post as needed; tooth #15 and Extraction, bone graft with covering membrane, dental implant, custom abutment and PFM crown, tooth #3 was made by the treating physician.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**PFM Crown, Root canal and post as needed; tooth #2:** Upheld

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

**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).

**Decision rationale:** Records reviewed indicate that this patient has been diagnosed with broken tooth, fractured due to trauma with dental caries and disturbance of salivary secretion. The injured continues to experience dental issues. However, in the treating dentist report of [REDACTED] there are insufficient documentation of dental objective findings with clear dental X-rays and caries assessment/topography of the gingiva and related structures and/or probing depths to support the requests. Also, the included dental X-rays are not legible. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale with clear X-rays, 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 reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This reviewer recommends not medically necessary at this time.

**PFM Crown, Root canal and post as needed; tooth #14:** Upheld

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

**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).

**Decision rationale:** Records reviewed indicate that this patient has been diagnosed with broken tooth, fractured due to trauma with dental caries and disturbance of salivary secretion. The injured continues to experience dental issues. However, in the treating dentist report of [REDACTED] there are insufficient documentation of dental objective findings with clear dental X-rays and caries assessment/topography of the gingiva and related structures and/or probing depths to support the requests. Also, the included dental X-rays are not legible. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale with clear X-rays, 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 reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This reviewer recommends not medically necessary at this time.

**PFM Crown, Root canal and post as needed; tooth #15:** Upheld

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

**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).

**Decision rationale:** Records reviewed indicate that this patient has been diagnosed with broken tooth, fractured due to trauma with dental caries and disturbance of salivary secretion. The injured continues to experience dental issues. However, in the treating dentist report of [REDACTED] there are insufficient documentation of dental objective findings with clear dental X-

rays and caries assessment/topography of the gingiva and related structures and/or probing depths to support the requests. Also, the included dental X-rays are not legible. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale with clear X-rays, 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 reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This reviewer recommends not medically necessary at this time.

**Extraction, bone graft with covering membrane, dental implant, custom abutment and PFM crown, tooth #3: Upheld**

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

**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).

**Decision rationale:** Records reviewed indicate that this patient has been diagnosed with broken tooth, fractured due to trauma with dental caries and disturbance of salivary secretion. The injured continues to experience dental issues. However, in the treating dentist report of [REDACTED] there are insufficient documentation of dental objective findings with clear dental X-rays and caries assessment/topography of the gingiva and related structures and/or probing depths to support the requests. Also, the included dental X-rays are not legible. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale with clear X-rays, 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 reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This reviewer recommends not medically necessary at this time.