

Case Number:	CM15-0120917		
Date Assigned:	07/01/2015	Date of Injury:	12/14/2007
Decision Date:	07/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/23/2015

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, Florida, 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 58 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/14/2007. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical disc disorder, shoulder tendinitis, carpal tunnel syndrome and lumbar disc displacement. Treatment to date has included acupuncture and medication management. In a progress note dated 5/14/2015, the injured worker complains of pain in the lumbosacral region, shoulders, cervical region, bilateral upper extremities, knees, chest and thoracic region, rated 6/10 with 8/10 being the worst and 5/10 at its best. Physical examination showed palpable bilateral shoulder tenderness, cervical tenderness, bilateral wrist tenderness and lumbar/sacroiliac tenderness. The treating physician is requesting follow up with Internal Medicine Specialist.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Follow-Up with Internal Medicine Specialist: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Practice Guidelines, chapter 7.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Chapter 7, page 127.

Decision rationale: This claimant was injured 8 years ago. The diagnoses were cervical disc disorder, shoulder tendinitis, carpal tunnel syndrome and lumbar disc displacement. Treatment to date has included acupuncture and medication management. As of this past May, there were subjective complaints of pain in the lumbosacral region, shoulders, cervical region, bilateral upper extremities, knees, chest and thoracic region, rated 6/10 with 8/10 being the worst and 5/10 at its best. There is palpable bilateral shoulder tenderness, cervical tenderness, bilateral wrist tenderness and lumbar/sacroiliac tenderness. The request is for internal medicine follow up. ACOEM Guidelines, Chapter 7, Page 127, state that the occupational health practitioner may refer to other specialists if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work. A consultant is usually asked to act in an advisory capacity, but may sometimes take full responsibility for investigation and/or treatment of an examinee or patient. There are no internal medicine specialty issues noted however in this injury case. Further, this request for the consult fails to specify the concerns to be addressed in the independent or expert assessment, including the relevant medical and non-medical issues, diagnosis, causal relationship, prognosis, temporary or permanent impairment, work capability, clinical management, and treatment options. At present, the request is not medically necessary.