

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0051079 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 03/24/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 11/26/2013 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 05/01/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 03/12/2015 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 03/17/2015 |

### 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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 34 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 11/26/13. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back and lower extremities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having rule out lumbar radiculopathy. Treatments to date have included oral medications and electromyography. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain in the back with radiation to the lower extremities. The plan of care was for medication prescriptions and a follow up appointment at a later date.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Internal medicine evaluation:** Upheld

**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 Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Office Visits.

**Decision rationale:** ODG states concerning office visits "Recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self-care as soon as clinically feasible". ACOEM states regarding assessments, "The content of focused examinations is determined by the presenting complaint and the area(s) and organ system(s) affected." And further writes that covered areas should include "Focused regional examination" and "Neurologic, ophthalmologic, or other specific screening". The medical documentation provided does not indicate the rationale behind this request, nor the specific goals of this referral. As such, the request for Internal medicine evaluation is not medically necessary.