

Case Number:	CM15-0187296		
Date Assigned:	09/29/2015	Date of Injury:	06/07/2001
Decision Date:	11/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/23/2015

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
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Dentist

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 38 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 7, 2001, incurring pelvis, low back and perineal injuries. He was diagnosed with a fractured pelvis, pelvic crush injury, bladder and urethral rupture. Treatment included many surgical interventions, pain medications, trigger point injections, muscle relaxants, antianxiety medications, physical therapy, and restricted activities. In 2011, the injured worker noted speech dysfunction secondary to muscle spasms. He was noted to have decreased chewing and increased bruxism. He developed dry mouth syndrome, tooth decay and periodontal disease from years of pain medication use. He complained of headaches and facial pain from tooth decay. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization on September 23, 2015, included one dental scan, x-ray and photos, one extraction, one graft, one stayplate, one implant, one abutment and one crown. On August 20, 2015, request for dental treatments was denied by utilization review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One extraction: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): Health Partners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines Medscape Reference: Tooth Extraction. Author: Talib Najjar, DMD, MDS, PhD; Chief Editor: Arlen D Meyers, MD, MBA.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth. Per reference mentioned above, "there are circumstances in which it is clear that a tooth must be extracted, such as the following: A tooth that cannot be restored, because of severe caries, A mobile tooth with severe periodontal disease, pulp necrosis, or periapical abscess, for which root canal treatment is required that the patient cannot afford (or for which endodontic treatment failed), Overcrowding of teeth in the dental arch, resulting in orthodontic deformity". Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one extraction #8 to be medically necessary to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.

One graft: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): HealthPartners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medscape Reference. Dental Implant Placement . Author: Jeff Burgess, DDS, MSD; Chief Editor: Arlen D Meyers, MD, MBAAust Dent J. 2014 Mar; 59 (1): 48-56. doi: 10.1111/adj.12098. Epub 2013 Aug 6. Current perspectives on the role of ridge (socket) preservation procedures in dental implant treatment in the aesthetic zone. Kassim B1, Ivanovski S, Mattheos N. Ann Periodontol. 2003 Dec;8 (1): 227-65. The efficacy of bone replacement grafts in the treatment of periodontal osseous defects. A systematic review. Reynolds MA1, Aichelmann-Reidy ME, Branch-Mays GL, Gunsolley JC.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, graft, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth. Per reference mentioned above, "Ridge preservation techniques are effective in minimizing post-extraction

alveolar ridge contraction" (Kassim B, 2014) and "In cases where there has been extensive alveolar bone loss following extraction, it may be necessary to provide bone augmentation prior to implant placement (Burgess)." Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one graft to be medically necessary to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.

One stayplate: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): Health Partners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head chapter.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth. While the implant is integrating, the dentist recommends the patient to wear an anterior temporary stay plate. Per reference mentioned above "Dental implants, dentures, crowns, bridges, onlays, inlays, braces, pulling impacted teeth, or repositioning impacted teeth, would be options to promptly repair injury to sound natural teeth required as a result of, and directly related to, an accidental injury." Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one stayplate to be medically necessary while the implant is integrating, to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.

One implant: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): Health Partners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth. Per reference mentioned

above "Rather than resting on the gum line like removable dentures, or using adjacent teeth as anchors like fixed bridges, dental implants are long-term replacements. The goal of replacing missing teeth while respecting otherwise untouched tooth structure and the avoidance of crown reduction in bridge preparation make the use of dental implants an option for restoring traumatic tooth loss." Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one implant #8 to be medically necessary to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.

One abutment: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): Health Partners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth. Per reference mentioned above "Rather than resting on the gum line like removable dentures, or using adjacent teeth as anchors like fixed bridges, dental implants are long-term replacements. The goal of replacing missing teeth while respecting otherwise untouched tooth structure and the avoidance of crown reduction in bridge preparation make the use of dental implants an option for restoring traumatic tooth loss. In situations where replacement of the tooth is accomplished by dental implants, the dental crown is also included." Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one abutment to be medically necessary to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.

One crown: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): Health Partners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided

X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth. Per reference mentioned above "Rather than resting on the gum line like removable dentures, or using adjacent teeth as anchors like fixed bridges, dental implants are long-term replacements. The goal of replacing missing teeth while respecting otherwise untouched tooth structure and the avoidance of crown reduction in bridge preparation make the use of dental implants an option for restoring traumatic tooth loss. In situations where replacement of the tooth is accomplished by dental implants, the dental crown is also included." Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one abutment to be medically necessary to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.

One dental scan, x-ray, photos: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of periodontal diseases. Minneapolis (MN): Health Partners Dental Group; 2011 Dec 9. 37 p.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Implant Soc. 1995;5(5):7-11. Radiographic modalities for diagnosis and treatment planning in implant dentistry. Garg AK1, Vicari A. 1 Center for Dental Implants, Division of Oral/Maxillofacial Surgery & Dentistry, University of Miami School of Medicine, Florida, USA.

Decision rationale: Records reviewed indicate that patient has fractured tooth #8 and Dentist states that tooth #8 is no longer serviceable and needs to be extracted. Also patient is complaining subjectively of a fractured tooth #8 which could not be restored. Dentist provided X-ray interpretation that a root fragment was visualized at the level of the bone. Dentist is recommending extraction, implant, abutment and crown on the tooth and one dental scan, x-ray, photos. Per reference mentioned above, "Today, the two most often employed and most applicable radiographic studies for implant treatment planning are the panoramic radiograph and tomography." Therefore based on the records reviewed, along with the findings and reference mentioned above, as well as methods used in Dentistry, this reviewer finds this request for one dental scan, x-ray, photos to be medically necessary to properly treat and replace this patient's tooth.