MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0052280		
Date Assigned:	03/25/2015	Date of Injury:	06/17/1998
Decision Date:	05/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/19/2015

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: California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Dentist

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 57 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/17/98. She reported low back pain and right shoulder pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having low back pain, lumbar degenerative disc disease, lumbar radiculitis, right shoulder pain, chronic pain syndrome, bruxism, and periodontal disease. Treatment to date has included medications and physical therapy. A physician's report dated 10/30/14 noted pain medication was being weaned off due to the injured worker testing positive for methamphetamine on two occasions. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain between the shoulder blades, right shoulder pain, low back pain which radiates to the left thigh, and right knee pain. The treating physician requested authorization for bone graft ext (spec), Surg extrac (spec), Implant/specialist, and member resorb (spec). No rational for the requested treatments was provided in the submitted medical records.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bone Graft Ext (spec): 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) Treatment Index 11th Edition (web) 2014 Head Dental Trauma.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation (9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

Decision rationale: In this case, there are no recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. There are also no records available from the requesting dentist and this is a non-specific request. This reviewer is not clear which tooth this request pertains to. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification at this time. The request is not medically necessary.

Surg Extrac (spec): 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) Treatment Index 11th Edition (web) 2014 Head Dental Trauma.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation (9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the

frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

Decision rationale: In this case, there are no recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. There are also no records available from the requesting dentist and this is a non-specific request. This reviewer is not clear which tooth this Surg Extrac request pertains to. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This IMR reviewer recommends non-certification at this time. The request is not medically necessary.

Implant/Specialist: 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) Treatment Index 11th Edition (web) 2014 Head Dental Trauma.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation (9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

Decision rationale: In this case, there are no recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. There are also no records available from the

requesting dentist and this is a non-specific request. This reviewer is not clear which tooth this "Implant/Specialist" request pertains to. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This reviewer recommends non-certification at this time. The request is not medically necessary.

Member resorb (spec): 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) Treatment Index 11th Edition (web) 2014 Head Dental Trauma.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines - General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation (9792.20. MTUS July 18, 2009 page 3 and ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 2) - A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear Page(s): 3.

Decision rationale: In this case, there are no recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints, and clinical examination including oral examination/periodontal evaluation, dental x-rays, caries assessment to support the requests. There are also no records available from the requesting dentist and this is a non-specific request. This reviewer is not clear which tooth this "member resorb" request pertains to. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case. This reviewer recommends non-certification at this time. The request is not medically necessary.