

Case Number:	CM15-0076233		
Date Assigned:	04/27/2015	Date of Injury:	05/08/2013
Decision Date:	06/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/21/2015

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: Pennsylvania

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Hospice & Palliative 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 64 year old male with an industrial injury dated May 8, 2013. The injured worker's diagnoses include status post myocardial infarction, status post percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty (PTCA), left atrial enlargement, hypertension, diabetes mellitus and hyperlipidemia. Treatment consisted of electrocardiogram, spirometry studies, hemodynamic studies, laboratory studies, chest x-ray and echocardiogram, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 3/30/2015, the injured worker presented for preoperative consultation for left shoulder surgery. The treating physician reported that the injured worker was unable to undergo the proposed surgery at that particular time. The treating physician prescribed services for thallium study, per 03/30/2015 due to the injured worker inability to walk on a treadmill.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Thallium Study, per 03/30/2015, quantity 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2208820>.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Garber AM, et al. Stress testing for the diagnosis of obstructive coronary heart disease. Topic 1534, version 14.0. UpToDate, accessed 05/31/2015. Yanowitz FG, et al. Stress testing to determine prognosis and management of patients with known or suspected coronary heart disease. Topic 1497, version 9.0. UpToDate, accessed 05/31/2015. Basile J, et al. Overview of hypertension in adults. Topic 3852, version 28.0. UpToDate, accessed 05/31/2015.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines are silent on this issue in this clinical setting. The literature and major guidelines support the use of nuclear stress testing for those who are having symptoms or findings of heart disease that put them in an intermediate risk for this condition and who are unable to complete an exercise stress test. Those with high risk and those with low risk for heart disease are better evaluated with other types of testing. The submitted documentation concluded the worker was suffering from diabetes and coronary artery disease with a prior heart attack and heart procedure approximately twelve years prior, among other issues. The worker had not had any testing for the heart in the prior four years. These records indicated the worker was experiencing episodes of problems breathing and that left shoulder surgery was being planned. A recent treating physician note suggested the worker could not exercise due to an unspecified back problem, but there was no description or documented detailed assessment of a back problem, and a recent treating physician note a few months prior stated the worker did not have any problems walking. There was no discussion describing special circumstances that sufficiently supported this request. In the absence of such evidence, the current request for a thallium study per date of service 03/30/2015 is not medically necessary.