

Case Number:	CM15-0147694		
Date Assigned:	08/18/2015	Date of Injury:	06/01/2014
Decision Date:	10/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/29/2015

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 52 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on May 01, 2012. She was employed as a paper recycler. The accident was described as having encountered cumulative trauma resulting in injury. A primary treating office visit dated July 01, 2015 reported current medications were: Hydrocodone, Neurontin, and Baclofen. She is with subjective complaint of having no change in symptom since last visit. She continues with pain in the right elbow that radiates up to her right shoulder. Objective assessment noted positive tenderness at the lateral elbow, pain with resisted dorsiflexion, and a positive Tinel's test medially. On January 19, 2015 she underwent a magnetic resonance imaging study of the left elbow that showed an unremarkable test. April 08, 2015 at a primary follow up she had subjective complaint of left elbow with increased pain since last visit; unable to bend left wrist. Current medications are: Hydrocodone and Neurontin. The treating diagnoses were: lateral epicondylitis bilateral elbow, unspecified pre-operative examination, and lesion of ulnar nerve. She is prescribed a modified work duty. The plan of care noted recommending a left lateral elbow tennis strap to be worn at all times; acupuncture care, and pain management follow up. The plan of care at follow up on May 10, 2105 reported the worker permanent and stationary. The plan of care noted recommending a left lateral elbow release then a staged right cubital tunnel release and post-operative physical therapy session.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left lateral release and reconstruction with Mitek suture: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Elbow Online version, Surgery for Epicondylitis.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Elbow Complaints 2007, Section(s): Lateral Epicondylalgia.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM Elbow chapter, page 35 recommends a minimum of 3-6 months of conservative care prior to contemplation of surgical care. ODG, Elbow section, Surgery for epicondylitis, recommends 12 months of non-operative management with failure to improve with NSAIDs, elbow bands/straps, activity modification and physical therapy program. In addition there should be failure of injection into the elbow to relieve symptoms. In this case there is insufficient evidence of failure of conservative care of 12 months from the exam note of 5/10/15 to warrant a lateral epicondylar release. Therefore the request is not 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: Electrocardiogram (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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: CBC: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: BMP: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: CMP: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: 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 cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: Urinalysis: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Associated surgical service: Postoperative physical therapy, 3x4 weeks, left elbow: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Tylenol No. 3 #60 (1-2 PO q4-6h PRN): 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.

Keflex 500mg #30: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate. This review presumes that a surgery is planned and will proceed. There is no medical necessity for this request if the surgery does not occur.