

Case Number:	CM15-0116299		
Date Assigned:	06/30/2015	Date of Injury:	01/26/2015
Decision Date:	09/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/16/2015

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, Indiana, Oregon
 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:

The injured worker is a 56 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 1/26/15 from a slip that caused sudden high impact jarring of the left leg and hip. He had immediate onset of left hip, thigh and buttock pain. He was medically evaluated, had x-rays and was transferred to via ambulance for possible left hip fracture. More x-rays were done and he was discharged home with medications. He had physical therapy. The pain persisted. MRI of the left hip (1/26/15) showed moderate degenerative changes of the left hip, mild atrophy, old healed sub-capsule fracture of the left femoral neck. He currently complains of persistent and increased left hip pain, stiffness and weakness, secondary to osteoarthritis that was exacerbated by a strain injury. On physical exam the range of motion of the lumbar spine, left hip were limited. Medications are Naprosyn, Norco. Diagnoses include left hip strain; right hip advanced hypertrophic osteoarthritis. Diagnostics include left hip x-ray (1/26/15) showing severe osteoarthritis with hypertrophic changes. In the progress note dated 4/28/15 the treating provider's plan of care included requests for total left hip replacement; two to three day inpatient hospital stay; surgical assistant; cardiac evaluation for surgery clearance; pre-operative laboratory evaluations, electrocardiogram, chest x-ray; post-operative physical therapy; commode chair; walker.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left total hip replacement: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Hip & Pelvis Chapter, Arthroplasty.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) hip.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of total hip arthroplasty. According to ODG, Hip and Pelvis, arthroplasty criteria described conservative care and objective findings. These must include either limited range of motion or night time joint pain. Objective findings include age greater than 50 years and BMI of less than 35. In this case BMI is substantially greater than 35. The request is not medically necessary.

Two to three day inpatient hospital stay: 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.

Surgical assistant: 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.

Cardiac evaluation for surgery 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.

Preoperative CBC: 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.

Preoperative CMP: 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.

Preoperative UA: 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.

Preoperative EKG: 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.

Preoperative chest x-ray: 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.

Post operative physical therapy: 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.

Associated Surgical Service: Commode chair: 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.

Associated Surgical Service: Walker: 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.