MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0069340		
Date Assigned:	04/27/2015	Date of Injury:	07/07/2010
Decision Date:	08/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/13/2015

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 who sustained an industrial injury on 07/07/2010. Diagnoses include bilateral De Quevain's tenosynovitis, bilateral first carpometacarpal joint degenerative arthritis, and bilateral wrist triangular fibrocartilage tears. Treatment to date has included status post bilateral carpal tunnel release, and diagnostic studies, medications, steroid injections, and splinting. A physician progress note dated 09/09/2014 documents the injured worker has been indicated to undergo bilateral wrist arthroscopies for the triangular fibrocartilage tear, she has been indicated to undergo bilateral first carpometacarpal joint arthroplasites with trapezium excisions and palmaris longus tendon grafts, and at the same time she would undergo bilateral DeQuervain's releases for the first dorsal compartments. There is a physician note dated 01/21/2015 which documents the injured worker received her injuries from continuous trauma relating to her required job duties as a caregiver. Treatment requested is for anesthesia costs, initial post-operative visit, left DeQuervain's release of the first dorsal compartment, left first carpometacarpal joint arthroplasty with trapezium excision and palmaris longus tendon graft, left wrist arthroscopy, Norco 5/325mg, #60, preoperative medical clearance, right DeQuervain's release of the first dorsal compartment, right first carpometacarpal joint arthroplasty with trapezium excision and palmaris linguis tendon graft, right wrist arthroscopy and twelve sessions of post-operative therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left wrist arthroscopy: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints, Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11, Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints, page 270, Referral for hand surgery consultation may be indicated for patients who: Have red flags of a serious nature, Fail to respond to conservative management, including worksite modifications, Have clear clinical and special study evidence of a lesion that has been shown to benefit, in both the short and long term, from surgical intervention. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting hand or wrist complaint. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks and benefits and, especially, expectations are very important. If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a physical medicine practitioner may aid in formulating a treatment plan. In this case the exam note from 1/21/15 does not demonstrate any evidence of red flag condition or documented failed nonsurgical management. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.

Right wrist arthroscopy: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11, Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints, page 270, Referral for hand surgery consultation may be indicated for patients who: Have red flags of a serious nature, Fail to respond to conservative management, including worksite modifications, Have clear clinical and special study evidence of a lesion that has been shown to benefit, in both the short and long term, from surgical intervention. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting hand or wrist complaint. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks and benefits and, especially, expectations are very important. If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a physical medicine practitioner may aid in formulating a treatment plan. In this case the exam note from 1/21/15 does not demonstrate any evidence of red flag condition or documented failed nonsurgical management. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.

Left first carpometacarpal joint arthroplasty with trapezium excision and palmaris longus tendon graft: 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), Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11, Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints, page 270, Referral for hand surgery consultation may be indicated for patients who: Have red flags of a serious nature, Fail to respond to conservative management, including worksite modifications, Have clear clinical and special study evidence of a lesion that has been shown to benefit, in both the short and long term, from surgical intervention. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting hand or wrist complaint. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks and benefits and, especially, expectations are very important. If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a physical medicine practitioner may aid in formulating a treatment plan. In this case the exam note from 1/21/15 does not demonstrate any evidence of red flag condition or documented failed nonsurgical management. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.

Right first carpometacarpal joint arthroplasty with trapezium excision and palmaris longus tendon graft: 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), Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11, Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints, page 270, Referral for hand surgery consultation may be indicated for patients who: Have red flags of a serious nature, Fail to respond to conservative management, including worksite modifications, Have clear clinical and special study evidence of a lesion that has been shown to benefit, in both the short and long term, from surgical intervention. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting hand or wrist complaint. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks and benefits and, especially, expectations are very important. If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a physical medicine practitioner may aid in formulating a treatment plan. In this case the exam note from 1/21/15 does not demonstrate any evidence of red flag condition or documented failed nonsurgical management. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.

Left de Quervain's release of the first dorsal compartment: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 271. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11, Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints, page 270, Referral for hand surgery consultation may be indicated for patients who: Have red flags of a serious nature, Fail to respond to conservative management, including worksite modifications, Have clear clinical and special study evidence of a lesion that has been shown to benefit, in both the short and long term, from surgical intervention. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting hand or wrist complaint. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks and benefits and, especially, expectations are very important. If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a physical medicine practitioner may aid in formulating a treatment plan. In this case the exam note from 1/21/15 does not demonstrate any evidence of red flag condition or documented failed nonsurgical management. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.

Right de Quervain's release of the first dorsal compartment: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 271. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11, Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints, page 270, Referral for hand surgery consultation may be indicated for patients who: Have red flags of a serious nature, Fail to respond to conservative management, including worksite modifications, Have clear clinical and special study evidence of a lesion that has been shown to benefit, in both the short and long term, from surgical intervention. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting hand or wrist complaint. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks and benefits and, especially, expectations are very important. If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a physical medicine practitioner may aid in formulating a treatment plan. In this case the exam note from 1/21/15 does not demonstrate any evidence of red flag condition or documented failed nonsurgical management. Therefore the determination is not medically necessary.

Anesthesia costs: 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, Pain, Office Visits.

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

Preoperative medical clearance: 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, Low Back, Preoperative testing.

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

Initial post operative visit: 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.

Twelve sessions of post operative therapy: 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.

Norco 5/325mg #60: 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.