

Case Number:	CM13-0061334		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2013	Date of Injury:	11/02/2010
Decision Date:	04/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	11/04/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/04/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in Illinois. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

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 patient is a 63-year-old male who reported an injury on 11/02/2010 due to cumulative trauma while performing normal job duties. The patient ultimately developed hearing loss and was fitted for Binaural BiCros Audio type digital hearing aids in 11/2011. A request was made on 10/30/2013 for an updated audiogram, hearing aid evaluation and reprogramming as well as additional hearing aid batteries.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

AUDIOGRAM: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Medical Disability Advisor by Presley Reed, MD. Tinnitus, Tests: Audiometric Evaluation and Cummings: Otolaryngology: Head & Neck Surgery, 4th ed. Chapter 152- Diagnostic and Rehabilitative Audiology. The Audiologist Test Battery.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter, Audiometry

Decision rationale: The requested audiogram is not medically necessary or appropriate. The Official Disability Guidelines recommend audiometry as a screening tool for patients who have occupational-related hearing loss. The Official Disability Guidelines recommend follow-up testing at 3-year intervals for patients older than the age of 50. The clinical documentation submitted for review does indicate that the patient underwent an audiogram in 09/2011. The clinical documentation did not provide any evidence of significant progressive symptoms that would support the need for a screening prior to the 3

HEARING AID EVALUATION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation the Medical Disability Advisor by Presley Reed, MD. Tinnitus, Tests: Audiometric Evaluation and Cummings: Otolaryngology: Head & Neck Surgery, 4th ed. Chapter 152- Diagnostic and Rehabilitative Audiology. The Audiologist Test Battery.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter, Hearing aids

Decision rationale: The requested hearing aid evaluation is not medically necessary or appropriate. The clinical documentation submitted for review does provide evidence that the patient currently uses hearing aids. The Official Disability Guidelines do recommend the use of hearing aids as an appropriate intervention for occupational-related hearing loss. However, the clinical documentation submitted for review does not provide any recent evaluation of the patient to support that the patient's current equipment is not functioning and would require further assessment or adjustment. Therefore, the need for a hearing aid evaluation is not medically necessary or appropriate.

REPROGRAMMING OF HEARING AID: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Hearing Aids, Author: Walter J Smoski, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, Illinois State University, Hearing Aid Candidacy

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter, Hearing aids

Decision rationale: The requested reprogramming is not medically necessary or appropriate. The clinical documentation submitted for review does provide evidence that the patient currently uses hearing aids. The Official Disability Guidelines do recommend the use of hearing aids as an appropriate intervention for occupational-related hearing loss. However, the clinical documentation submitted for review does not provide any recent evaluation of the patient to support that the

1 CARTON OF 80 BATTERIES: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Hearing Aids, Author: Walter J Smoski, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology, Illinois State University, Hearing Aid Candidacy

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head Chapter, Hearing aids

Decision rationale: The requested 1 carton of 80 batteries is not medically necessary or appropriate. The Official Disability Guidelines do recommend hearing aids as an appropriate intervention for patients who suffer from occupational-related hearing loss. However, the clinical documentation submitted for review does indicate that the patient received hearing aid batteries in 11/2011. The documentation submitted for review indicates that the patient is currently out of hearing aid batteries; however, it is noted that 1 hearing aid battery lasts for approximately 4 months, depending on the patient's usage. The clinical documentation submitted for review did not contain any recent evaluation or assessment of the patient's usage of the patient's hearing aids. Therefore, the need for an entire carton of 80 batteries is not clearly established. As such, the requested 1 carton of 80 batteries is not medically necessary or appropriate.