

Case Number:	CM14-0162234		
Date Assigned:	10/07/2014	Date of Injury:	09/27/2003
Decision Date:	10/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/02/2014

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 Internal Medicine and is licensed to practice in District of Columbia and Virginia. 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:

This is a 43 year old patient who sustained injury on Sep 27 2003. He underwent a C5-C6 discectomy and fusion and C6-7 reconstruction. [REDACTED] saw the patient on Sep 2 2014 for ongoing pain in the lower back, left shoulder and bilateral knees. He was taking Motrin, Prilosec, Flexeril, hydrocodone, Ambien and Tramadol. The patient had issues with shortness of breath, chest pain and palpitations. He was found to have hypertension. He was recommended to have impedance cardiography.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Impedance Cardiography (ICG): Overturned

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: <http://impedancecardiography.com/icgover10.html>
http://impedancecardiography.com/PDF/WebMun_outp_030905.pdf
http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/744573_4

Decision rationale: The patient had issues with high blood pressure and was given a blood pressure monitor. He was ordered to have this testing. ACOEM and MTUS do not specifically address this medication. Impedance cardiography is used for risk stratification to risk stratify patients with cardiovascular disease. This testing would be medically indicated.