
Independent Medical Review Final Determination Letter

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dated: 12/27/2013

Employee:	[REDACTED]
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]
Date of UR Decision:	7/23/2013
Date of Injury:	12/19/2011
IMR Application Received:	8/15/2013
MAXIMUS Case Number:	CM13-0011351

Dear [REDACTED]

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Medical Review (“IMR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IMR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

Final Determination: UPHOLD. This means we decided that none of the disputed items/services are medically necessary and appropriate. A detailed explanation of the decision for each of the disputed items/services is provided later in this letter.

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties.

In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 30 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations, [REDACTED]

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in PM&R, and is licensed to practice in Pennsylvania. 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 physician 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/services.

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The physician reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The underlying date of injury in this case is 12/19/2011. This patient has a diagnosis of chronic pain with stress and anxiety. Initial physician review notes that this patient has documentation of a lack of progress after an initial 4-week trial of physical medicine using a cognitive behavioral approach although notes that the number of visits of 10 visits exceeds the treatment guidelines for 4 visits.

IMR DECISION(S) AND RATIONALE(S)

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

1. Bio Feedback therapy 10 times 6 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), second edition, which is part of the MTUS. The Claims Administrator also based its decision on the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), which is not part of the MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Section on Biofeedback, pages 24-25, which is part of the MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale:

The Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines Section on Biofeedback, page 24-25, states, "recommended as an option in a cognitive behavioral therapy program... Initial trial of 3-4 psychotherapy visits over 2 weeks." The guidelines therefore would support an initial trial for biofeedback visits but not 10 visits over 6 weeks as requested in this case. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.

[REDACTED]

CM13-0011351