

Case Number:	CM15-0013476		
Date Assigned:	02/02/2015	Date of Injury:	11/18/2013
Decision Date:	03/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/19/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/23/2015

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: Texas, Ohio, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 51 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/18/2013. The diagnoses have included bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. Treatments to date have included right carpal tunnel release on 10/07/2014, physical therapy, Occupational Therapy, and medications. Diagnostic studies not noted in received medical records. In a progress note dated 10/14/2014, the injured worker presented with complaints of right wrist pain. Utilization Review determination on 12/19/2014 non-certified the request for Pneumatic Compressor Unit Device with Wraps citing Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule/American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine Guidelines.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pneumatic Compressor Unit device with wraps: 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

<http://www.bssh.ac.uk/education/guidelines/vteguidelines>

Decision rationale: The applicant is a represented Intercontinental [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for wrist pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of November 18, 2013. In a Utilization Review Report dated December 19, 2014, the claims administrator denied a request for a pneumatic compressor unit with associated wrap. The claims administrator referenced progress notes and RFA forms of December 16, 2014 and December 18, 2014 in the determination. The claims administrator noted that the applicant had undergone carpal tunnel release surgery on August 15, 2014. The claims administrator did not incorporate any guidelines into its rationale. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On July 29, 2014, the applicant apparently received a medical clearance for surgery. The applicant was returned to regular duty work. The applicant received a left-sided carpal tunnel release surgery on August 15, 2014. Retrospective authorization was sought for a pneumatic compression device apparently dispensed on or around the date of surgery, via an RFA form of November 18, 2014.

REFERRAL QUESTIONS: 1. No, the request for a pneumatic compressor unit, a form of DVT prophylaxis, was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. The MTUS does not address the topic. However, the British Society for Surgery (BSS) of the hand notes that risk factors for venous thromboembolism include active cancer or cancer treatment, known thrombophilia, obesity, usage of hormone replacement therapy, age greater than 60, personal history or first-degree relative with a history of venous thromboembolism, and/or a protracted duration of procedure, such as a procedure greater than 90 minutes. Here, the carpal tunnel release procedure of August 15, 2014, by all accounts, appears to have been a short, low-risk procedure. There was no mention of the applicant's having any risk factors for development of a venous thromboembolism such as a history of the same, history of known thrombophilia, history of cancer, etc. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.