

Case Number:	CM15-0193506		
Date Assigned:	10/07/2015	Date of Injury:	02/10/2015
Decision Date:	11/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/01/2015

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 33 year old female, who sustained an industrial-work injury on 2-10-15. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for mold exposure, cephalgia, fatigue, shortness of breath and sleep disorder. Treatment to date has included medication, diagnostics, labs, and 5 body mass composition studies the latest done 8-25-15. Medical records dated 8-25-15 indicate that the injured worker reports improving shortness of breath. Per the treating physician report dated 8-25-15, the work status is full duty. The physical exam dated 8-25-15 reveals that the lungs are clear to auscultation, there are no rales or wheezes, and there is no dullness to percussion. There are no other significant findings noted. The request for authorization date was 8-25-15 and requested service included Body composition study. The original Utilization review dated 9-3-15 non-certified the request for Body composition study.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Body composition study: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation

https://www.bcbsri.com/sites/default/files/policies/CPT_Category_III_Codes_0.pdf>.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Arch Dis Child. 2006 Jul; 91(7): 612-617. doi: 10.1136/adc.2005.085522 PMID: PMC2082845 Measuring body composition J C K Wells and M S Fewtrell.

Decision rationale: The MTUS guidelines do not comment on body composition analysis. Measuring BMI or waist circumference offers valuable information that are equal or more predictive of fat, lipid profile and risk for insulin resistance. Although body composition analysis may be beneficial for elite athletes to maximize performance, the claimant had respiratory issues from industrial exposure. The body composition study is not medically necessary.