

Case Number:	CM15-0040560		
Date Assigned:	04/09/2015	Date of Injury:	12/17/2008
Decision Date:	08/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/03/2015

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: California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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 62 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 12/17/2008. His diagnoses, and/or impressions, included: left shoulder/arm labral tear and impingement syndrome; and evidence of prior labral repair, Buford complex variant and rotator cuff tendinopathy. No current magnetic resonance imaging studies are noted. His treatments have included cortisone injection therapy; physical therapy - ineffective and discontinued; modified activities; anti-inflammatory medications; and medication management. Progress notes of 9/12/2014 reported left shoulder complaints of constant pain with no improvement or change in symptoms. Limited range-of-motion and impingement sign of the left shoulder were objectively noted. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include left shoulder arthroscopy with repair; an assistant surgeon; pre-operative laboratories, urinalysis and electrocardiogram; shoulder brace and abduction pillow; a cold therapy unit; and post-operative physical therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left shoulder arthroscopy with acromioclavicular repair and possible labral repair: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 209-210. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) shoulder section, acromioplasty surgery.

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS/ACOEM Shoulder Chapter, page 209-210, surgical considerations for the shoulder include failure of four months of activity modification and existence of a surgical lesion. The ODG shoulder section, acromioplasty surgery recommends 3-6 months of conservative care plus a painful arc of motion from 90-130 degrees that is not present in the submitted clinical information from 9/12/14. In addition, night pain and weak or absent abduction must be present. There must be tenderness over the rotator cuff or anterior acromial area and positive impingement signs with temporary relief from anesthetic injection. In this case, the exam note from 9/12/14 does not demonstrate evidence satisfying the above criteria. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Assistant surgeon: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: shoulder brace with abduction pillow: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: cold therapy unit: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Post-op physical therapy (PT) 3 time 4: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op testing: Complete Blood Count (CBC), Chem: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Urinalysis (UA) and Electrocardiography (EKG): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.