

Case Number:	CM15-0121260		
Date Assigned:	07/08/2015	Date of Injury:	01/21/2015
Decision Date:	09/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/16/2015
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: 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:

The injured worker is a 63-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on January 21, 2015. The injured worker was diagnosed as having shoulder impingement syndrome and partial thickness tear of supraspinatus tendon. Treatment to date has included injections, x-rays, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and medication. A progress note dated May 5, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of right shoulder pain. He reports there is no improvement from previous visit. He rates the pain 8/10. Physical exam notes decreased painful range of motion (ROM) with positive impingement. Review of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) reveals near full thickness tear of supraspinatus tendon. The plan includes right shoulder arthroscopy with associated services.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right shoulder arthroscopy, rotator cuff repair, biceps tenotomy vs. tenodesis, subacromial decompression, damage repair as indicated: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Shoulder.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 2092-210. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Shoulder, Surgery for rotator cuff repair.

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 submitted notes from 5/5/15 do not demonstrate 4 months of failure of activity modification. Therefore, 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.

Associated surgical service: 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.

Associated surgical service: 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.

Associated surgical service: Labs: 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-op physical therapy, 2 x 8 for the right 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.

Post-op shoulder sling with abduction pillow: 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: Cold compression therapy and supplies: 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.