

Case Number:	CM15-0020782		
Date Assigned:	02/10/2015	Date of Injury:	10/27/2014
Decision Date:	05/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/04/2015

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 31-year-old male who sustained a work related injury on October 27, 2014, as a result of his hand being crushed between two sheet boards on a machine. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) revealed effusions within the carpal joints and synovitis and a sprain injury to the wrist. Treatments included physical therapy, wrist brace and medications. Currently, on January 7, 2015, the injured worker complained of pain in the wrist with numbness and tingling in the fingers. Electromyogram studies were requested. On February 10, 2015, a request for preoperative clearance; assistant surgeon; one right carpal tunnel release and 12 sessions of post operative physical therapy were non-certified by Utilization Review, noting California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Guidelines and Official Disability Guidelines.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right Carpal Tunnel Release: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints, Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM, 2nd Edition, Chapter 7, Independent Medical Examinations and

Consultations, Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Online Edition, Chapter: Carpal Tunnel Syndrome.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 270.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints page 270, Electrodiagnostic testing is required to evaluation for carpal tunnel and stratify success in carpal tunnel release. In addition, the guidelines recommend splinting and medications as well as a cortisone injection to help facilitate diagnosis. In this case, there is lack of evidence in the records from 1/7/15 of electrodiagnostic evidence of carpal tunnel syndrome. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Assistant Surgeon: 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.

Pre-Operative 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.

Post-Operative Physical Therapy (12-sessions): 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.