

Case Number:	CM15-0118911		
Date Assigned:	07/02/2015	Date of Injury:	09/26/2012
Decision Date:	09/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/19/2015

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 59 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/26/2012. Diagnoses have included bilateral wrist sprain/strain status post carpal tunnel release, right ring and middle finger triggering, left elbow medial epicondylitis and left shoulder sprain with impingement and ultrasound evidence of high grade, partial thickness rotator cuff tear. Treatment to date has included chiropractic treatment and medication. According to the progress report dated 2/4/2015, the injured worker complained of left shoulder pain and weakness. She reported not being able to wash her hair. Exam of the left shoulder revealed tenderness to palpation. The progress report was hand-written and difficult to decipher. The injured worker declined a cortisone injection as she had a bad experience in the past. Authorization was requested for left shoulder arthroscopic evaluation, rotator cuff repair, rotator cuff debridement, subacromial decompression, and distal clavicle resection and related services.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left shoulder arthroscopic evaluation, rotator cuff repair, rotator cuff debridement, subacromial decompression, and distal clavicle resection: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints.

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

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. The ODG Shoulder section, surgery for rotator cuff repair, recommends 3-6 months of conservative care with a painful arc on exam from 90-130 degrees and night pain. There also must be weak or absent abduction with tenderness and impingement signs on exam. Finally there must be evidence of temporary relief from anesthetic pain injection and imaging evidence of deficit in rotator cuff. In this case the imaging does not demonstrate full thickness rotator cuff tear. The request is not medically necessary.

Pre-op 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.

Supervised post-op rehabilitative therapy 3 x 4 for left shoulder: 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: Home continuous passive motion device for left shoulder x 45 days initial period: 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: Immobilizer with abduction pillow for left shoulder: 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: Surgi-stim unit for left shoulder x 90 days initial period:
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: Cool care cold therapy unit for left shoulder: 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.