

Independent Medical Review Final Determination Letter

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dated: 12/26/2013

IMR Case Number:	CM13-0003205	Date of Injury:	8/3/2001
Claims Number:	[REDACTED]	UR Denial Date:	7/1/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	7/25/2013
Employee Name:	[REDACTED]		
Provider Name:	[REDACTED] MD		
Treatment(s) in Dispute Listed on IMR Application:	Please reference utilization review determination letter		

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 Neurology and is licensed to practice in New York. 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:

46 year old with a date of injury 8/3/2001 with chronic complaint of LBP and right leg pain. She underwent L5-S1 anterior lumbar interbody fusion on 6/26/12, the surgery did improve lower back pain. She then underwent Physical therapy treatments. Patient was also started on Lyrica for the lower extremities complaints. It is also noted that she has urinary frequency and urgency incontinence-like symptoms without pelvic numbness. Urology consult was requested. Ct myelogram was requested.

IMR DECISION(S) AND RATIONALE(S)

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

1. 1 CT myelogram of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary and appropriate.

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Official Disability Guidelines, which are not part of the MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer found that no section of the MTUS was applicable. Per the Strength of Evidence hierarchy established by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Workers' Compensation, the Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the American College of Radiology Guidelines, Indications for CT Myelogram.

The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale:

The treating physician did not adequately describe the specific history and physical findings that might be indications for the CT myelogram. This patient does not fulfill the criteria delineated by the American College of Radiology guidelines.

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]

CM13-0003205