

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0127605		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/14/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/22/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/01/2015

### 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 male, who sustained an industrial injury on November 22, 2010. The injured worker was diagnosed as having right shoulder rotator cuff repair, tendinosis of supraspinatus, acromioclavicular osteoarthopathy and cervical disc protrusion and radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included medication, surgery, physical therapy and Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) unit. A progress note dated February 27, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of neck pain rated 7/10 and right shoulder pain rated 8/10. Physical exam notes cervical spasm at the right trapezius area and right shoulder tenderness with atrophy, decreased range of motion (ROM) and crepitus. There is a request for right shoulder arthroscopic surgery with related services.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Right shoulder arthroscopic subacromial decompression and conversion of the type 3 to type 1 acromion:** 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. The ODG shoulder section, acromioplasty surgery recommends 3-6 months of conservative care plus a painful arc of motion from 90-130 degrees. In addition night pain and weak or absent abduction must be present. There must be tenderness over the rotator cuff or anterior acromial area and positive impingement signs with temporary relief from anesthetic injection. In this case records do not demonstrate evidence satisfying recent comprehensive non-surgical management, notably relief with anesthetic injection. Therefore the request does not adhere to guideline recommendations and is not medically necessary.

**Related surgical service: Anesthesia:** 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) shoulder.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Related surgical service: Pre-operative labs CBC with diff, US Chem panel (CMP, PT, PTT):** 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) shoulder.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Related 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 base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) shoulder.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Related surgical service: History, physical:** 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) shoulder.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Related surgical service: Post-operative physical therapy, three times weekly for four weeks:** 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) shoulder.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.