

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0145596		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/06/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/28/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/10/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/20/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/27/2015

### 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: Texas, New York, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 applicant is a represented 51-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic low back pain, shoulder, and leg pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of March 28, 2014. On July 20, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for a venous valvular exam. The claims administrator referenced an RFA form received on July 13, 2015 in its determination. The full text of the UR determination was not seemingly attached to the application, it was incidentally noted. In a June 6, 2015 progress note, the applicant reported complaints of itching and dry skin about the right lateral ankle, it was reported. The applicant had swelling about both ankles and had a known history of venous varicosities x8 years, it was reported. The applicant was overweight, with a BMI of 34, it was reported. Based on height of 6 feet 1 inches and weight of 250 pounds, it was reported. The applicant exhibited numerous venous varicosities with swelling about the right ankle as compared to left. The attending provider stated that venous reflux study was needed to address the applicant's underlying venous anatomy. The applicant was asked to employ compressive stockings in the interim. The requesting provider was a vascular surgeon.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Venous Vulvar Exam:** Overturned

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 366. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation AIUM Practice Guideline for the Performance of Peripheral Venous Ultrasound Examinations III.

**Decision rationale:** Yes, the request for a venous valvular exam to assess the extent of the applicant's venous varicosities was medically necessary, medically appropriate, and indicated here. As noted in the MTUS Guideline in ACOEM Chapter 14, page 366, the attending provider should assess the neurologic and vascular status of the foot and ankle and/or observe the skin for trophic changes. Here, the requesting provider, a vascular surgeon, reported on June 15, 2015 that the applicant had known issues with venous varicosities of the legs, bilateral, and the applicant had associated swelling about the ankles. The American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine (AIUM) notes that the indications for peripheral venous ultrasound examinations include the evaluation of venous obstruction in symptomatic individuals. Here, the applicant was, by all accounts, a symptomatic individual consulting a vascular surgeon, who was seemingly planning surgical intervention for the applicant's symptomatic venous varicosities. Obtaining the venous ultrasound in question was indicated to delineate the extent of the applicant's venous varicosities, per the AIUM. Therefore, the request was medically necessary.