

## Independent Medical Review Final Determination Letter

1056  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dated: 12/17/2013

<b>IMR Case Number:</b>	CM13-0018424	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/28/2008
<b>Claims Number:</b>	[REDACTED]	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/15/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	STANDARD	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/29/2013
<b>Employee Name:</b>	[REDACTED]		
<b>Provider Name:</b>	PROVIDER INFORMATION NOT PROVIDED		
<b>Treatment(s) in Dispute Listed on IMR Application:</b>			
RIGHT COMMON EXTENSOR TENDON RELEASE			

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]  
[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 Orthopedic Surgery and is licensed to practice in Connecticut, North Carolina and 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:

- Application of Independent Medical Review
- Utilization Review Determination
- Medical Records from Claims Administrator
- Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS)

### 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 claimant is a 37-year-old female injured in a work related accident on 5/28/08. The current clinical records indicate she injured her right wrist, forearm and elbow working as a billing clerk performing customary job duties. It states since the time of injury she has been treated with activity restrictions, medication management, corticosteroid injections and work modifications. There is understanding of prior surgery on 8/2/12 in the form of a first extensor compartment release to the right wrist for preoperative diagnosis of first extensor compartment tendinosis. Postoperatively a 7/10/13 assessment indicated the claimant is with continued elbow pain with physical examination showing the wrist to be with a well healed scar and no elbow evaluation noted. It states due to a diagnosis of tennis elbow surgical intervention was recommended in the form of a common extensor tendon release procedure. Previous testing has included electrodiagnostic studies on 8/11/10 that showed evidence of right ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. Imaging in regards to the elbow is otherwise not documented. As stated the surgical process in the form of a right common extensor tendon release is recommended for further definitive care. A prior Utilization Review of 8/8/13 denied the above request citing a lack of documentation of recent.

### IMR DECISION(S) AND RATIONALE(S)

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

**1. Right common extensor tendon release is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, (2004) Updates: Chapter: 10, pg.36, which is part of the MTUS and the Official Disability Guidelines, Elbow Section, which is not part of the MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, (2004) Updates: Chapter: 10, pg.36, which is part of the MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale:

MTUS guidelines for surgical intervention to the lateral epicondyle indicate that lateral epicondylitis tends to be more a self limiting condition with only rare need of surgical intervention in patients that do not respond to six months of aggressive conservative measures. In this case, the medical records submitted for review provide no indication of recent conservative care. The employee may be with continued subjective complaints, however there is no documentation of objective findings to support the above diagnosis. Thus, the documentations submitted for review fails to necessitate the requested surgical intervention. **The request for right common extensor tendon release is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

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]

CM13-0018424