

Case Number:	CM14-0176695		
Date Assigned:	10/30/2014	Date of Injury:	12/04/2008
Decision Date:	12/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/15/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/24/2014

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 Family Medicine 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:

68 years old female claimant sustained a cumulative work injury from 8/1/08 to 12/4/08 involving the left wrist. She was diagnosed with carpal tunnel syndrome. A progress note on 11/16/14 indicated the claimant had diffuse swelling in the left dorsal wrist, bilateral wrist tenderness, and a positive Tinel's test bilaterally. A request was made to replace bilateral wrist braces.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Replace Wrist Brace x 2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 265.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 271.

Decision rationale: Although the guidelines recommend splinting for treating carpal tunnel syndrome, prolonged splinting can lead to stiffness and weakness. The claimant sustained the injury 6 years ago. Prolonged and continuous use of a wrist brace is not indicated. Therefore, the request for replace Wrist Brace x 2 is not medically necessary and appropriate.