

Case Number:	CM15-0128892		
Date Assigned:	07/15/2015	Date of Injury:	09/07/2013
Decision Date:	08/12/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/02/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 43 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/7/13. He reported pain in his left wrist. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bilateral wrist carpal tunnel syndrome. Treatment to date has included Aleve, Ibuprofen, a right carpal tunnel release surgery on 1/8/15, left carpal tunnel release surgery on 1/7/14 and physical therapy. As of the PR2 dated 5/12/15, the injured worker reports persistent right wrist pain despite physical therapy and left wrist clicking with range of motion of fingers. The treating physician noted tenderness to palpation over the palmar and dorsal aspect of the left wrist and 4/5 grip strength. The treating physician requested an MR Arthrogram of the left wrist.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MR (magnetic resonance) Arthrogram, Left Wrist: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): table 11-6.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 268-272. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Forearm, wrist and Hand, Magnetic Resonance Imaging.

Decision rationale: ACOEM states, "For most patients presenting with true hand and wrist problems, special studies are not needed until after a four- to six-week period of conservative care and observation. Most patients improve quickly, provided red flag conditions are ruled out. Exceptions include the following:-In cases of wrist injury, with snuff box (radial-dorsal wrist) tenderness, but minimal other findings, a scaphoid fracture may be present. Initial radiographic films may be obtained but may be negative in the presence of scaphoid fracture. A bone scan may diagnose a suspected scaphoid fracture with a very high degree of sensitivity, even if obtained within 48 to 72 hours following the injury." ODG states for a wrist MRI "Indications for imaging - Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI): Acute hand or wrist trauma, suspect acute distal radius fracture, radiographs normal, next procedure if immediate confirmation or exclusion of fracture is required; Acute hand or wrist trauma, suspect acute scaphoid fracture, radiographs normal, next procedure if immediate confirmation or exclusion of fracture is required; Acute hand or wrist trauma, suspect gamekeeper injury (thumb MCP ulnar collateral ligament injury); Chronic wrist pain, plain films normal, suspect soft tissue tumor- Chronic wrist pain, plain film normal or equivocal, suspect Kienbck's disease; Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology." The treating physician has provided no evidence of red flag diagnosis and has not met the above ODG and ACOEM criteria for an MRI Of the wrist. As such, the request for MR (magnetic resonance) Arthrogram, Left Wrist is not medically necessary.