

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

Independent Medical Review

P.O. Box 138009

Sacramento, CA 95813-8009

(855) 865-8873 Fax: (916) 605-4270



Notice of Independent Medical Review Determination

Dated: 11/25/2013

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Employee:	[REDACTED]
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]
Date of UR Decision:	7/9/2013
Date of Injury:	12/6/2010
IMR Application Received:	7/29/2013
MAXIMUS Case Number:	CM13-0004398

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for functional capacity evaluation **is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW DECISION AND RATIONALE

An application for Independent Medical Review was filed on 7/29/2013 disputing the Utilization Review Denial dated 7/9/2013. A Notice of Assignment and Request for Information was provided to the above parties on 8/8/2013. A decision has been made for each of the treatment and/or services that were in dispute:

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for functional capacity evaluation **is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Medical Qualifications of the Expert Reviewer:

The independent Medical Doctor who made the decision has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Preventive Medicine and Occupational Medicine, and is licensed to practice in California. 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 treatments and/or services at issue.

Expert Reviewer Case Summary:

The applicant, Mr. [REDACTED], is a [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for neck pain, carpal tunnel syndrome, wrist pain, and hypertension reportedly associated with an industrial injury of December 6, 2010.

Thus far, the applicant has been treated with the following: Analgesic medications; unspecified amounts of physical therapy; transfer of care to and from various providers in various specialties; lumbar support; unspecified amounts of manipulative therapy; and extensive periods of time off of work.

The most recent progress note of July 29, 2013 is notable for comments that the applicant is status post laminectomy and microdiscectomy at L4-L5 on July 18, 2013. The applicant exhibits 5/5 lower extremity motor strength. Recommendations are made for the applicant to seemingly undergo functional capacity evaluation.

Documents Reviewed for Determination:

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 [REDACTED]
- Medical Records from employee representative
- Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS)

1) Regarding the request for functional capacity evaluation :

Section of the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Relied Upon by the Expert Reviewer to Make His/Her Decision

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, page 137-138, which is part of the MTUS and the Official Disability Guidelines, (ODG), Fitness for Duty Guidelines for Performing an FCE, which is not part of the MTUS.

The Expert 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 Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the ACOEM Practice Guidelines 2nd Edition., Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Chapter 7, pgs. 137-138.

Rationale for the Decision:

The MTUS does not specifically address the topic. As noted in the second edition ACOEM guidelines in chapter 7, functional capacity evaluations (FCEs) are not necessarily an accurate characterization of what an employee can or cannot do. Rather, FCEs represent a simplified set of tests which reflects what an employee can do on a single day. FCEs are highly effort dependent. In this case, the request for the FCE was initiated less than a month after the employee's prior spine surgery. The employee's work status and functional status are unknown. It is not clearly stated whether the employee has a job to return to and/or has returned to work on a trial basis. There is no evidence of multiple unsuccessful returns to work trials which might make a case for an FCE. **The request for a functional capacity evaluation is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Effect of the Decision:

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the final determination of the Administrative Director, Division of Workers' Compensation. With respect to the medical necessity of the treatment in dispute, this determination is binding on all parties.

In accordance with California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h), a determination of the administrative director may be reviewed only if a verified appeal is filed with the appeals board for hearing and served on all interested parties within 30 days of the date of mailing of the determination to the employee or the employer. The determination of the administrative director shall be presumed to be correct and shall be set aside only upon proof by clear and convincing evidence of one or more of the grounds for appeal listed in Labor Code Section 4610.6(h)(1) through (5).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations
Division of Workers' Compensation
1515 Clay Street, 18th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

/pas

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.