

Case Number:	CM15-0062183		
Date Assigned:	04/08/2015	Date of Injury:	09/07/2010
Decision Date:	05/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/01/2015

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: Texas, Florida, 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 injured worker is a 48 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on September 7, 2010. She reported dizziness, nausea, headaches, extreme fatigue, and depression while working in a bakery, determined to have been exposed to carbon monoxide over an extended period of time. The injured worker was diagnosed as having single episode of moderate major depression, generalized anxiety disorder, and cognitive disorder. Treatment to date has included cognitive therapy. Currently, the injured worker complains of nightmares, increased anxiety, and memory issues. The Primary Treating Physician's report dated February 23, 2015, noted the mental status examination showed the injured worker's affect was appropriate to her mood of moderately depressed. The treatment plan was noted to include continued Fetzima, increase the Klonopin, start Prazosin, continue with psychological therapy, and notation that the injured worker may benefit from a full course of speech therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Speech therapy consultation with 6 follow-up visits: 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)- head, speech therapy.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Chapter 7, page 127.

Decision rationale: Technically, ACOEM Chapter 7 is not within the MTUS collection; therefore, it is more appropriately cited under the "Other Guidelines" categorization. This claimant allegedly had long term low level carbon monoxide exposure. There are psychological issues and complaints how there is no objective documentation of speech issues, or why speech therapy would be needed for the psychological depression. ACOEM Guidelines, Chapter 7, Page 127, state that the occupational health practitioner may refer to other specialists if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work. A consultant is usually asked to act in an advisory capacity, but may sometimes take full responsibility for investigation and/or treatment of an examinee or patient. This request for the consult fails to specify the concerns to be addressed in the independent or expert assessment, including the relevant medical and non-medical issues, diagnosis, causal relationship, prognosis, temporary or permanent impairment, work capability, clinical management, and treatment options. At present, the request is not medically necessary.