

Case Number:	CM15-0060647		
Date Assigned:	04/06/2015	Date of Injury:	11/27/1996
Decision Date:	05/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/30/2015

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 62 year old male injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 11/27/1996. The diagnoses included failed back surgery and xerostomia. The injured worker had been treated with medications. On 3/4/2015 the treating provider reported a high level lower back pain and bilateral shoulder pain with depression. The pain is located in the bilateral arms, bilateral legs, bilateral shoulders, bilateral buttocks, bilateral knees and bilateral low back. The frequency of pain and spasticity is worsening. With medications the pain is 6/10, the average is 8/10 and the worst 9/10. There has been poor dentition. The treatment plan included 4 Dental X-ray, 4 Dental problem focus examinations, and 4 Dental periodic examinations.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

4 Dental X-rays: 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), Head, Dental trauma treatment (facial fractures).

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 records available from the requesting dentist. There is also insufficient documentation on the medical necessity for this request for dental X-rays and there are no recent documentation of claimant's current dental complaints. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for these X-ray requests 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 and the request is not medically necessary.

4 Dental problem focus examinations: 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), Head, Office Visits.

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 records available from the requesting dentist. There is also insufficient documentation on the medical necessity for this request for multiple dental problem focus examinations. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for these 4 examinations are 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 and the request is not medically necessary.

4 Dental periodic examinations: 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), Head, Office Visits.

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 records available from the requesting dentist. There is also insufficient documentation on the medical necessity for this request for multiple dental examinations. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for these 4 examinations are 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 and the request is not medically necessary.