

Case Number:	CM15-0082508		
Date Assigned:	05/04/2015	Date of Injury:	01/20/2013
Decision Date:	08/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/29/2015

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: Surgery, General Vascular 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 45 year old male injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 01/20/2013. The diagnoses included bilateral varicose veins. The diagnostics included lumbar and right knee magnetic resonance imaging. The injured worker had been treated with support hose. On 3/13/2015, the treating provider reported more problems with the right leg. She continued to work but now has throbbing of the right leg in additions to the left leg. It was particularly worse after 16-hour shifts. She still uses hose for the left leg but not for the right. On exam, there were bilateral spider veins but now there was definite nodularity to the right leg in addition to the left leg. The right leg shows tortuosities going up to the thigh posteriorly and from the tight down to the calf through the popliteal fossa. The treatment plan included Bilateral Varicose Vein Stripping and Ligation, Ted hose, Pre-operative, Venous Doppler Scan, and Assistant Surgeon.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Associated Surgical Services: 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 base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: American College of Surgeons document, Physicians as Assistants at Surgery, 2013.

Decision rationale: Typically, vein stripping does not require another MD as an assistant. According to the American College of Surgeons document, Physicians as Assistants at Surgery, 2013, an assistant surgeon for the proposed surgery is not typically necessary, and surgeons generally do not require an assistant for this surgery. Medical necessity for an assistant surgeon for this procedure is demonstrated by a higher than usual level of complexity and technical difficulty. Absent such information, an assistant surgeon is not medically necessary. The necessary supporting information has not been provided in the available medical records. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.