

Case Number:	CM15-0126340		
Date Assigned:	07/10/2015	Date of Injury:	09/26/2014
Decision Date:	08/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2015

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, New York, 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 applicant is a represented 43-year-old [REDACTED] beneficiary who has filed a claim for chronic knee, shoulder, low back, hand, and wrist pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of September 26, 2014. In a Utilization Review report dated June 12, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for MRI imaging of the brain. The full text of the UR report was not, it is incidentally noted, attached to the IMR application. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On June 1, 2015, the applicant reported ongoing complaints of shoulder, wrist, hand, elbow, and knee pain. The applicant was placed off of work, on total temporary disability. 5/10 pain complaints were reported. The attending provider stated, toward the bottom of the report that, he was intent on ordering MRI imaging of the brain to evaluate for a brain contusion; however, there was no seeming mention of the applicant's having issues with headaches at any point in the body of the report or in the review of systems section of the same. The stated diagnoses were left shoulder injury with labral tear, left wrist contusion, left ulnar nerve contusion, and left knee pain. An earlier note of February 5, 2015 did suggest that the applicant had a pending neurological evaluation and also suggested that the applicant had issues with headaches and dizziness present at that point in time. These issues were only incidentally discussed, were not elaborated upon, and were not mentioned in the diagnoses section of the report.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the brain: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head, MRI (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: No, the request for MRI imaging of the brain was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. The MTUS does not address the topic. While ODG's Head Chapter MRI Imaging topic does acknowledge that MRI scans are useful to assess transient or permanent damages, to determine the etiology of subsequent clinical problems and/or to plan treatment, here, however, it was not clearly stated for what issue, diagnosis, symptom, and/or purpose the MRI imaging in question was proposed. The June 1, 2015 progress note made no mention of the applicant's having issues with headaches. While a historical note of February 5, 2015 did suggest that the applicant had symptoms of dizziness and headaches, these were: (a) neither elaborated nor expounded upon; and (b) were not discussed or mentioned, even obliquely, on the June 1, 2015 progress note on which the brain MRI was ordered. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.