

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0209615		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/28/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/11/2006
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/10/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/06/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/24/2015

### 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:

This is a 65 year old female who sustained a work-related injury on 7-11-06. Medical record documentation on 9-14-15 revealed the injured worker was being treated She reported intermittent abdominal pain and dyspepsia controlled with medications. Objective findings included clear lungs, regular heart rate and rhythm and a soft abdomen. Her medication regimen included meclizine 25 mg, Tylenol #3, Metoprolol 50 mg, Citalopram 10mg, alprazolam 5 mg, Valacyclovir 500 mg and B 12. A body composition study was performed which revealed a height of 64 inches and weight of 209 lbs. Her target weight was 160 lbs. and her BMI was 35.9 which had elevated. A request for body composition study was received on 9-29-15. On 10-6-15 the Utilization Review physician determined body composition study was not medically necessary.

### 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 [www.PubMed.gov](http://www.PubMed.gov).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American Heart Association and guidelines for body composition. Web Resource- 2015.

**Decision rationale:** According to the referenced guidelines, BMI remains the standard for monitoring weight in relation to body size. Although body composition study may be beneficial in those for athletic training or endocrine disorders, it is not a necessity for weight loss management. In addition the claimant had prior studies and there is no indication for repeat studies. The request is not medically necessity.