

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0066705		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/14/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/23/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/14/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/27/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/08/2015

### 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: Dentist

### 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(n) 39 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/23/13. He reported pain in the mouth, left hand and left side related to falling 17 feet off a ladder. The injured worker was diagnosed as having tooth erosion #3-14. Treatment to date has included dental x-rays and pain medications. The QME report dated 1/16/15, the treating physician noted mesio-incisal angles of teeth #8 and 9 were fractured. As of the PR2 dated 3/3/15, the injured worker reports after his filling his last tooth chipped #31. The treating physician requested one (1) teeth #'s 7, 8, 9 and 10 (root canal) endodontic therapy, anterior tooth.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**One (1) teeth #'s 7, 8, 9 and 10 (root canal) endodontic therapy, anterior tooth:** 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 Chapter.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation Page(s): 3, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**Decision rationale:** A focused medical history, work history, and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job-related disorder. The initial medical history and examination will include evaluation for serious underlying conditions, including sources of referred symptoms in other parts of the body. The initial assessment should characterize the frequency, intensity, and duration in this and other equivalent circumstances. In this assessment, certain patient responses and findings raise the suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions. These are referred to as red flags. Their absence rules out the need for special studies, immediate consultation, referral, or inpatient care during the first 4 weeks of care (not necessarily the first 4 weeks of the worker's condition), when spontaneous recovery is expected, as long as associated workplace factors are mitigated. In some cases a more complete medical history and physical examination may be indicated if the mechanism or nature of the complaint is unclear, page 3. Records of the Panel QME dentist [REDACTED] dated 01/16/15 has diagnosed this patient with Teeth Fracture due to trauma stating "with reasonable medical probability, the fractures on teeth #8 and 9 are in relationship with the industrial fall." He further recommends restorations' of teeth #8 and 9. However there are no mention of teeth #7 and #10 in the panel QME dentist report and the hand written progress note from the requesting dentist dated 03/05/15 is hardly legible with insufficient documentation on why this patient now also needs treatment on teeth # 7 & 10. Absent further detailed documentation and clear rationale, the medical necessity for this request is not evident. Per medical reference mentioned above "a focused medical history, work history and physical examination generally are sufficient to assess the patient who complains of an apparently job related disorder" in order to evaluate a patient's needs. This reviewer does not believe this has been sufficiently documented in this case.