

Case Number:	CM15-0200733		
Date Assigned:	10/15/2015	Date of Injury:	08/30/2005
Decision Date:	11/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/13/2015

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: Illinois

Certification(s)/Specialty: Ophthalmology

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 54-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 8-30-2005 and is being treated for low back pain, neck pain, and visual defects secondary to traumatic brain injury per the 4-14-2015 note. The injured worker has been under the care of a neuro-ophthalmologist who has prescribed 3 new pairs of glasses and is also awaiting approval for prismatic sunglasses. Specific visual disturbances are noted as hyperopia, presbyopia and dry eye syndrome. The treating physician's plan of care includes distance glasses, reading glasses and sunglasses. These were denied on 9-25-2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

DME: Distance glasses, reading glasses and sunglasses: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American Academy of Ophthalmology Preferred Practice Pattern.

Decision rationale: This is a patient with traumatic brain injury who also has chronic pain and chronic dry eyes. His examination reveals that he has mild myopic astigmatism and presbyopia. Obviously, the patient's refractive error is not related to his original injury. Nonetheless, if one considers refractive error to be a medical condition that requires treatment, then in this case prescribing glasses would be considered medically necessary.