

Case Number:	CM15-0039282		
Date Assigned:	03/09/2015	Date of Injury:	02/01/2013
Decision Date:	04/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/02/2015

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: Texas, Florida, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 46 year old right hand dominant female, who sustained a work/industrial injury on 2/1/13. She has reported initial symptoms of pain to neck, left wrist, and both shoulders. The injured worker was diagnosed as having radiculopathy, thoracic disc disease, and shoulder impingement syndrome. Treatments to date included medication (Ibuprofen, Gabapentin, and Baclofen), chiropractic care, injections, pain management with shoulder injections, and physical therapy. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) on 6/13/13 showed mild disc desiccation at T3-4 and T4-5. Currently, the injured worker complains of cervical spine with pain secondary to radiculitis and shoulder pain. The treating physician's report (PR-2) from 1/30/15 indicated there was 50-60% improvement with second shoulder injection, range of motion was still limited to about 90 degrees of flexion and extension. Physical therapy was approved and she exercised on a regular basis. Pain level remained high that was described as burning and tingling with average rate of 6-7/10. Exam noted moderate spasm, facet and pericervical tenderness. Left arm Spurling's test was positive and positive shoulder abduction, drop arm, and Neer test. Plan was for continuation of physical therapy, continue pain medication. Labs were ordered on 12/1/14 with diagnosis of long term use of medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

CBC QTY: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is appropriate non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

Chem Panel QTY: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

Decision rationale: As shared previously, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is appropriate non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

Uric acid QTY: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

Decision rationale: As shared previously, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether

medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is appropriate non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

RA Factor QTY: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

Decision rationale: As shared previously, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is appropriate non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

C-reactive Protein QTY: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is appropriate non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.

Lyme disease panel QTY: 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/health-topics/topics/bdt/>.

Decision rationale: Again, as shared previously, the MTUS and ODG are silent on blood tests. Other resources were examined. The National Institutes of Health notes that blood tests check for certain diseases and conditions, the function of your organs, show how well treatments are working, diagnose diseases and conditions such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, anemia, and coronary heart disease, find out if there are risk factors for heart disease, check whether medicines are working, or if blood is clotting. In this case, the doctor does not disclose the basis for the blood tests; and it is not clear the impact on improving the patient's functionality post injury. There was insufficient information to do a valid review of clinical necessity of the proposed service. The request is appropriate non-certified under the medical sources reviewed.