

Case Number:	CM15-0113191		
Date Assigned:	06/19/2015	Date of Injury:	03/11/2012
Decision Date:	09/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/11/2015

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: California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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 53 year old man sustained an industrial injury on 3/11/2012. The mechanism of injury is not detailed. Evaluations include right shoulder MRI dated 4/6/2015 which reveals no evidence of full thickness rotator cuff tear but degenerative changes. Diagnoses include right shoulder rotator cuff syndrome with probable early osteoarthritis and biceps tendinopathy and possible rotator cuff partial thickness tear. Treatment has included oral medications. Physician notes on a PR-2 dated 5/7/2015 show complaints of right shoulder pain, click, and decreased range of motion. Recommendations include surgical intervention.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right shoulder scope, biceps tenodesis debridement and possible rotator cuff repair:
Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints
Page(s): 209-210.

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS/ACOEM Shoulder Chapter, page 209-210, surgical considerations for the shoulder include failure of four months of activity modification and existence of a surgical lesion. In addition the guidelines recommend surgery consideration for a clear clinical and imaging evidence of a lesion shown to benefit from surgical repair. In this case the MRI from 4/6/15 does not demonstrate a surgical lesion such as a high grade or full thickness tear and therefore determination is not medically necessary.

Assistant surgeon: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Medical clearance: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

12 post op physical therapy sessions for the right shoulder (3x4): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Cold therapy unit (7 day rental): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Ultra sling: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.