

Case Number:	CM15-0204734		
Date Assigned:	10/21/2015	Date of Injury:	10/18/2010
Decision Date:	12/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/19/2015

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: North Carolina
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 68 -year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 10-18-2010 and has been treated for bilateral rotator cuff tendonitis, bursitis and rotator cuff tear; thoracic spine fracture; cervical disc injury; post-traumatic stress disorder; and, ambulation and activities of daily living dysfunction. On 9-17-2015 the injured worker reported continued discomfort but characterization of subjective symptoms was unspecified. Objective findings include myofascial tightness in the mid-back with painful range of motion. The right shoulder was noted as positive for tenderness to palpation with painful range of motion, and he had right knee tenderness upon palpation. Documented treatment includes right shoulder replacement surgery 10-18-2012, Norco, Celebrex stated to enable him to function, and he is noted to have been denied a request for participation in a functional restoration program. The physician stated that he is not a surgical candidate. There are no records provided discussing additional prior therapies or treatments. The treating physician's plan of care includes a request for a two day functional capacity evaluation, but this was denied on 9-28-2015. Current work status is temporarily partially disabled.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

2 day functional capacity evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Fitness for Duty, Functional Capacity Evaluation (FCE).

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

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address functional capacity evaluations. Per the ODG, functional capacity evaluations (FCE) are recommended prior to admission to work hardening programs, with preference for assessments tailored to a specific job. Not recommended as a routine use as part of occupational rehab or screening or generic assessments in which the question is whether someone can do any type of job. Consider FCE 1. Case management is hampered by complex issues such as: a. Prior unsuccessful RTW attempts. b. Conflicting medical reporting on precaution and/or fitness for modified jobs. c. Injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities. 2. Timing is appropriate. a. Close or at MMI/all key medical reports secured. b. Additional/secondary conditions clarified. There is no indication in the provided documentation of prior failed return to work attempts or conflicting medical reports or injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities. Therefore criteria have not been met as set forth by the ODG and the request is not medically necessary.