

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0110754		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/19/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/16/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/29/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/09/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Alabama, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 71 year old male injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 11/19/2008. The diagnoses included mixed urinary incontinence and chronic scrotal pain. The diagnostics included post void residual and urinalysis. The injured worker had been treated with male sling and Ditropan. On 8/19/2014 the treating provider reported the chronic scrotal pain had been resistant to numerous treatments. The provider recommended athletic support underwear to see if it may help with the occasional scrotal ache and gave one to the injured worker at that visit to try. The treatment plan included athletic support underwear.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**1 athletic support underwear:** 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 Scanlan, A. T., et al. (2008). "The effects of wearing lower-body compression garments during endurance cycling." Int J Sports Physiol Perform 3(4): 424-438.

**Decision rationale:** The provider requested athletic support underwear to help with scrotal ache. There is no controlled studies or even case report study supporting the use of athletic support underwear for scrotal ache. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.