

Case Number:	CM15-0145925		
Date Assigned:	08/06/2015	Date of Injury:	06/14/2014
Decision Date:	09/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	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: California, Arizona, Maryland
Certification(s)/Specialty: Psychiatry

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 33 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 6-14-14. Initial mechanism of injury is described as electrocution resulting in bilateral lower extremity injury, headaches, memory difficulties, seizure disorder and insomnia. The injured worker was diagnosed as having status post electrical injury with subsequent inability to use the bilateral lower extremities; seizure disorder subsequent to his electrical injury. Treatment to date has included physical therapy; acupuncture; medications. Currently, the PR-2 notes dated 6-25-15 indicated the injured worker has recently been able to try acupuncture and it has been helping quite a bit. It has been able to decrease his headaches from daily to one every few days. He reports being happy with the results. He would like to continue with acupuncture. However, the injured worker reports the additional aquatic therapy has not been authorized. He was making significant progress using his walker and he has requested a rollator walker with handbrakes. The provider will check into the authorization. There is a change in providers due to his insurance. He would like to make sure his medications will be provided and would like sent to a new psychiatrist for those medications. Prazosin, Zyprexa and Zoloft and Simvastatin are prescribed through a psychiatrist. He uses a wheelchair and able to maneuver and push himself around relatively well. The provider is requesting authorization of psychiatric consultation with treatment.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Psychiatric consultation: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Chapter 6 Independent Medical Examination and Consultations, Page 127, 156. Official Disability Guidelines, Disability Duration-Work Loss Data.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 15 Stress Related Conditions Page(s): 398.

Decision rationale: ACOEM guidelines page 398 states: "Specialty referral may be necessary when patients have significant psychopathology or serious medical co-morbidities" Also it states: "Issues regarding work stress and person job fit may be handles effectively with talk therapy through a psychologist or a mental health professional. Patients with more serious mental health conditions made need referral to psychiatry for medicine therapy." The injured worker suffered industrial trauma in form of electrocution resulting in bilateral lower extremity injury, headaches, memory difficulties, seizure disorder and insomnia. It has been suggested that he has been prescribed Prazosin, Zyprexa and Zoloft and has been in treatment with a Psychiatrist and Psychologist. It has been suggested that he had a change in providers due to his insurance and he wants to be sent to a new psychiatrist. The request for one Psychiatric consultation is medically necessary.