MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0143160		
Date Assigned:	08/04/2015	Date of Injury:	05/09/2013
Decision Date:	08/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/26/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/23/2015

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, Oregon, Washington
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 34-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5-9-2013. He reported acute left shoulder pain radiating to upper back with lifting activity. Diagnoses include neck sprain, shoulder and upper arm sprain, and adjustment disorder with depressed mood. Treatments to date include medication therapy, physical therapy, and cortisone injection. Currently, he complained of left shoulder pain. On 6-18-15, the physical examination documented tenderness of the left shoulder with decreased range of motion and positive joint stress tests. The treatment diagnoses included left shoulder impingement syndrome and distal clavicle arthrosis. The plan of care included left shoulder arthroscopy and associated services. The appeal requested authorization for a pre-operative cardiology clearance.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pre-operative cardiology clearance: 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), Low Back, Preoperative electrocardiogram (ECG).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low back, Preoperative testing general.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of preoperative clearance and testing. ODG, Low back, Preoperative testing general, is utilized. This chapter states that preoperative testing is guided by the patient's clinical history, comorbidities and physical examination findings. ODG states, these investigations can be helpful to stratify risk, direct anesthetic choices, and guide postoperative management, but often are obtained because of protocol rather than medical necessity. The decision to order preoperative tests should be guided by the patient's clinical history, comorbidities and physical examination findings. Patients with signs or symptoms of active cardiovascular disease should be evaluated with appropriate testing, regardless of their preoperative status. Preoperative ECG in patients without known risk factor for coronary artery disease, regardless of age, may not be necessary. CBC is recommended for surgeries with large anticipated blood loss. Creatinine is recommended for patient with renal failure. Electrocardiography is recommended for patients undergoing high-risk surgery and those undergoing intermediate risk surgery who have additional risk factors. Patients undergoing low risk surgery do not require electrocardiography. Based on the information provided for review, there is no indication of any of these clinical scenarios present in this case. In this case the patient is a healthy 34 year old without comorbidities or physical examination findings concerning to warrant preoperative testing prior to the proposed surgical procedure. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.