

Case Number:	CM15-0185721		
Date Assigned:	09/25/2015	Date of Injury:	07/09/2014
Decision Date:	11/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/21/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 is a 53-year-old male with a date of injury on 7-9-2014. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for lumbosacral sprain-strain, cervical sprain-strain, bilateral rib fractures, bilateral shoulder sprain-strain, thoracic sprain-strain, and left forearm abrasion and strain. Medical records (4-20-2015 to 8-12-2015) indicate ongoing headaches radiating to the back of the neck and the shoulders. The injured worker complained of cervical spine pain radiating to the left hand with numbness and tingling. He complained of upper and lower back pain. He complained of bilateral shoulder pain and left arm pain. Per the treating physician (8-12-2015), the work status was modified work. The physical exam (4-20-2015 to 8-12-2015) of the left shoulder revealed decreased range of motion, which was improving and tenderness to palpation. Impingement test was positive on the left. Treatment has included left hand and forearm surgery, chiropractic treatment and medications. The original Utilization Review (UR) (8-21-2015) denied a request for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the left shoulder.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the left shoulder: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Shoulder Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Shoulder Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

Decision rationale: Guidelines state routine MRI or arthrography is not recommended without surgical indication such as clinical findings of rotator cuff tear. It may be supported for patients with limitations of activity after four weeks and unexplained physical findings, such as effusion or localized pain (especially following exercise), imaging may be indicated to clarify the diagnosis and assist reconditioning; however, this has not been demonstrated with negative impingement sign and lack of neurological deficits. Criteria for ordering imaging studies such include Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electro diagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication for the MRI. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MRI of the left shoulder is not medically necessary and appropriate.