

Case Number:	CM15-0163449		
Date Assigned:	08/31/2015	Date of Injury:	11/25/2008
Decision Date:	09/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/20/2015

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: Arizona, California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 November 25, 2008 resulting in radiating low back pain. Diagnoses according to MRI of March 23, 2015 include previous lumbar fusion, and L2-4 disc herniation was noted. There is no diagnosis related to psychological symptoms or treatment rendered in provided medical records. The treating physician's plan of care includes consultation with a psychologist.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Consultation with a psychologist: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, 2004, 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) office guidelines-pain chapter and pg 92.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines, office visits are recommended as medically necessary. 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. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. 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. A specialist referral may be made if the diagnosis is uncertain, extremely complex , when psychosocial factors are present , or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A consultation is used to aid in diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or examinee's fitness for return to work. In this case, there is no mention of psychological problems, no mention of particular medication problems. As a result, the request for a psychological consultation is not medically necessary.