

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM14-0118401 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 08/06/2014   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 10/10/2011 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 11/13/2014   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 07/15/2014 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 07/28/2014 |

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Dentistry and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

Records reviewed indicate that this is a 26 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on October 10, 2011. The patient slipped and fell on a wet tile at work and landed on his face, which resulted in injuries to the head and face, including two chipped upper front teeth and jaw pain. UR report dated 07/15/14 state: " There were no medical records available for my review. The only two forms were a request for authorization form and a dental claim form. Without a progress note demonstrating the medical necessity for the zoom in house whitening of the patient's teeth, the medical necessity for such a procedure cannot be justified." [REDACTED] Report dated 03/10/14 states: The claimant was referred to the general dentist as a result of a QME report and slip and fall injury in October, 2011. He has had the root canal treatments done on teeth #8 and 9 and the permanent crowns were placed on teeth #8, 9 and 10 with temporary cement, to see if the claimant was happy with the crowns. During the visit, the general dentist recommended Zoom Whitening. Zoom Whitening is a whitening system that involves a special light applied to the teeth while the whitening product is applied to the teeth. Since teeth #8 and 9 have been restored with crowns, there appears to be no reason for Zoom Whitening, which is generally considered a cosmetic procedure and unrelated to the injury. Panel QME [REDACTED] report dated 2/14/14 state: It has been more than 2 years since [REDACTED] first injured his teeth and he has not yet received adequate dental treatment. As a result, he has developed complications with his bite and self-esteem. [REDACTED] should be given provisions for the repair of his anterior front teeth #8, 9 and 10 on an industrial basis as soon as possible. Treatment options may include root canal therapy (preferably with a root canal specialist, endodontist), posts and ceramic crowns on teeth #8, 9 and 10. He should also be given provisions on an industrial basis for the cavity fillings at teeth #13 and #14 as he may have developed difficulty with home care hygiene as result of discomfort on his anterior teeth. Additionally, at this time,

since he is not yet reached maximal medical improvement, dental prophylaxis treatment is advised on an industrial basis.

### **IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES**

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

**Zoom in-house whitening, body part: teeth:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation HealthPartners Dental Group and Clinics treatment planning guidelines. Minneapolis (MN): HealthPartners:2009 Mar 23. 10p. (21 references)

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation Page(s): 3. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG)

**Decision rationale:** Since this patient has had the root canal treatments done on teeth #8 and 9 and the permanent crowns were placed on teeth #8, 9 and 10 and these teeth have been restored with crowns, there appears to be no reason for Zoom Whitening, which is generally considered a cosmetic procedure and unrelated to the injury. There is also no medical justification with clear rationale from the treating dentist on why this patient needs zoom whitening and how it relates to the industrial injury. This IMR reviewer finds this request for zoom whitening medically unnecessary.