California Workers' Compensation Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Reports: A Legal Analysis

(PART-A INJURED WORKERS ANALYSIS)

March 1, 2026

The information provided through this AI-powered Analysis is for **general informational and educational purposes only**. It is **not legal advice**, does **not create an attorney-client relationship**, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for advice from a qualified attorney. Laws and legal outcomes vary based on specific facts and jurisdiction. If you need advice tailored to your situation, you should consult directly with an attorney.

CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION QME REPORTS: A LEGAL ANALYSIS

A Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) is a state-certified doctor who conducts an independent medical evaluation when you and your employer's insurance company disagree about medical issues in your workers' compensation case. A QME report is the written document this doctor produces after examining you. This report often determines whether your claim is accepted, how much disability you receive, and what medical treatment you are entitled to.

The QME process is governed by Cal. Lab. Code §§ 4060–4062.2 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2) and detailed regulations in Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, §§ 1–159 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html). This report explains how QME reports work, what they must contain, how to request one, and what to do if you receive an unfavorable report.

> ***Important: The quality of a QME report directly affects your claim outcome. A thorough, well-reasoned report strengthens your case. An incomplete or poorly written report can lead to claim denial, reduced disability benefits, or delays in receiving treatment.***

Part 1: The Laws That Control the QME Process

This section explains the California statutes that create and govern the QME evaluation system.

Key Statutes

Several sections of the California Labor Code work together to establish when and how you can get a QME evaluation:

- Labor Code § 4060 applies when the insurance company denies that your injury is work-related (industrial). This section gives you the right to request a medical evaluation to prove your injury happened at work. Cal. Lab. Code § 4060 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74060-medical-evaluations-fo-denied-claims/).
- Labor Code § 4061 covers disagreements about permanent disability (lasting physical limitations from your injury) and apportionment (whether part of your disability comes from causes other than work). Cal. Lab. Code § 4061 (https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/).
- Labor Code § 4062 addresses all other medical disputes, including whether a specific treatment is medically necessary, whether you have reached maximum medical improvement (MMI) (the point where your condition will not get better with more treatment), and your temporary disability status. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/).
- Labor Code § 4062.1 sets the procedure for getting a QME panel when you do not have a lawyer. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.1 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-1-panel-qme-process-unrepresented-workers/).
- Labor Code § 4062.2 sets the procedure when you do have a lawyer. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.2 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2).

Report Requirements Statute

Labor Code § 4628 lists 15 specific elements that every QME report must include to be accepted as evidence. If a report fails to meet these requirements, the law says it cannot be used as evidence and the evaluator will not be paid. Cal. Lab. Code § 4628 (https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf).

Regulatory Framework

The California Code of Regulations, Title 8, §§ 1–159 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html) provides detailed rules for QME practice. These regulations cover panel requests (§ 30 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html)), appointment scheduling (§ 34 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/34.html)), information exchange (§ 35 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html)), evaluator compliance (§ 35.5 (https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/8-CCR-35.5)), report service (§ 36 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html)), report timelines (§ 38 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html)), and ethical requirements (§ 41 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/41.html)).

Part 2: How to Start the QME Process

This section explains what triggers a QME evaluation and the steps you must follow to request one.

What Triggers a QME Evaluation

The QME process begins when there is a written disagreement about a medical issue in your case:

- For denied claims (§ 4060): The process starts when the claims administrator (the insurance company representative handling your claim) sends you a written denial saying your injury is not work-related. You then have the right to request a QME panel. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 30 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html).
- For permanent disability disputes (§ 4061): The process starts when either you or the claims administrator sends a written objection to a treating doctor's finding about your permanent disability. The objection must name the doctor, identify the report being challenged, and describe the specific medical issue in dispute.
- For treatment and other disputes (§ 4062): The process starts with a written objection to your treating doctor's recommendation about treatment necessity, MMI status, or other medical issues.

Timing Rules Based on Representation

Your timing requirements depend on whether you have a lawyer:

- If you do not have a lawyer (§ 4062.1): Either you or the claims administrator may request a QME panel at any time after the written objection is communicated. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.1 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-1-panel-qme-process-unrepresented-workers/).
- If you have a lawyer (§ 4062.2): The parties must first try to agree on an Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME)—a doctor both sides choose together, who does not need to be a QME. You have 10 days from the first written AME proposal to reach agreement, with a possible 20-day extension. Neither party may request a QME panel until at least 10 days (plus mailing time) after the written objection. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.2 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2).

How to Submit a Panel Request

- Unrepresented workers must submit QME Form 105 by mail to the Division of Workers' Compensation Medical Unit at P.O. Box 71010, Oakland, CA 94612. You must attach the denial notice (for § 4060 disputes) or the written objection (for § 4061 or § 4062 disputes) and a proof of service showing you sent a copy to the other side. QME Form 105 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/qmeforms/qmeform105.pdf).
- Represented workers must submit QME Form 106 online through the DWC internet system (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/OnlineQMEForm106PanelRequest.html). The system is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. After generating the panel online, you must print and serve paper copies on the opposing party within one working day. DWC FAQs on QME Form 106 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/FAQs.html).

> ***Important: The online system will reject your request if a panel has already been issued for your case, if not enough time has passed since the objection was mailed (at least 16 calendar days), or if there are not enough QMEs in the specialty you requested.***

Part 3: Selecting Your QME from the Panel

This section explains how a QME is chosen from the three-doctor panel the state provides.

If You Do Not Have a Lawyer

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.1 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-1-panel-qme-process-unrepresented-workers/), you have 10 working days from when the panel is issued to:

1. Choose one doctor from the three-name panel.
2. Schedule an appointment with that doctor.
3. Notify your employer of your choice and the appointment date.

> ***Critical: If you miss this 10-day deadline, your employer can pick any remaining doctor on the panel and schedule the appointment. You lose your right to choose.***

If You Have a Lawyer

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.2 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2), the process has two stages:

- Agreement stage (10 days): Within 10 days of the panel being assigned, both sides must talk and try to agree on one doctor from the panel. If they agree, that doctor becomes the evaluator.
- Striking stage (3 working days): If the parties do not agree, each side may strike (remove) one name from the three-doctor panel within 3 working days. The remaining doctor becomes the evaluator automatically.

If one side fails to strike a name on time, the other side may select any remaining doctor. Sullivan on Comp – QME Selection If a Party Fails to Timely Strike (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/qme-selection-if-a-party-fails-to-timely-strike).

After selection, your lawyer must schedule the appointment within 10 days and notify the employer. If your lawyer fails to schedule on time, the employer may arrange the appointment instead.

The Appointment Notification

Once selected, the QME must send an Appointment Notification Form (Form 110) to all parties within 5 business days of the appointment being made. This form tells you the date, time, and location and whether you need a certified interpreter. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 34 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/34.html).

- A QME cannot cancel your appointment less than 6 business days before the scheduled date unless there is good cause (a valid reason like a medical emergency).
- If the QME cancels, the QME must reschedule within 60 calendar days.
- You are not charged any missed appointment fee when the QME cancels for good cause.

Part 4: What a QME Report Must Include

This section lists the required elements of a QME report and explains why each matters to your case.

The 15 Mandatory Elements

Cal. Lab. Code § 4628 (https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf) and Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 10682 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html) require that every QME report include all of the following where they apply to your case:

1. Date and location of the examination (street address where you were examined).
2. History of your injury as you reported it and as shown in medical records.
3. List of all information reviewed by the doctor in preparing the report — every medical record, test result, and prior report must be named.
4. Your medical history, including prior injuries, pre-existing conditions, and their effects.
5. Objective findings on examination — measurable results like range of motion, strength tests, and imaging results. The doctor cannot rely only on your description of pain.
6. Diagnosis of your condition(s).
7. Nature, extent, and duration of disability and your specific work limitations (for example, "cannot lift more than 10 pounds").
8. Cause of disability — whether your disability is from the work injury, a pre-existing condition, or other causes.
9. Treatment recommendations — past, current, and future medical care needed.
10. Permanent disability determination — whether your condition is permanent and stationary (P&S), meaning it will not improve further.
11. Apportionment analysis — if part of your disability comes from non-work causes, the report must explain what percentage and why.
12. Psychiatric causation (psychiatric injury cases only) — the percentage of your condition caused by actual events at work.

13. Medical reasoning — the doctor must explain why they reached each conclusion, with reference to objective findings and medical principles.
14. Physician's signature.
15. Any other information required by the Medical Director.

Why These Elements Matter

The medical reasoning requirement (element 13) is especially important. A report that says "you have 10% disability" without explaining how the doctor reached that number is not considered valid evidence. The doctor must show their work — which tables from the AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment they used, what objective findings support the rating, and what medical principles justify their conclusions. LFLM LLP – Steps to Prevent and Combat a Poorly Written Medical-Legal Report (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/steps-to-prevent-and-combat-a-poorly-written-medical-legal-report/).

> ***Critical: Under Cal. Lab. Code § 4628(e), a report that fails to include these required elements is inadmissible — it cannot be used as evidence at all, and the evaluator will not be paid for the work.***

Part 5: Causation, Permanent Disability, and Apportionment

This section explains the three most important medical-legal issues that QME reports must address.

Causation: Is Your Injury Work-Related?

For disputes about whether your injury is industrial (caused by work), the QME must determine whether your condition more likely than not arose from your employment. The legal standard is "reasonable medical probability" — meaning it is more likely than not (greater than 50% chance) that your work caused the condition. Yrulegui & Roberts – WCAB Emphasizes Proper Standards (https://www.rjylaw.com/when-medical-opinions-fall-short-wcab-emphasizes-proper-standards-in-workers-compensation-cases/).

The doctor must look at:

- The time between your work exposure and when symptoms started
- How the injury relates to your specific job duties
- Whether the condition is consistent with a work-related cause

> ***Important: The Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) has ruled that QMEs must use clinical judgment and review all evidence holistically. They cannot demand the higher level of proof used in scientific research. The legal standard of "reasonable medical probability" is different from and lower than scientific statistical certainty.***

Permanent Disability Rating

When the QME finds you have reached permanent and stationary status (your condition will not improve further), the doctor must rate your disability using the AMA Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment. The doctor assigns a whole person impairment (WPI) percentage, which the Disability Evaluation Unit (DEU) then adjusts for your age and occupation under Cal. Lab. Code § 4660 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf).

For injuries on or after January 1, 2013, the WPI rating is multiplied by a 1.4 adjustment factor. DWC FAQs on the PDRS (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html).

Under the Almaraz/Guzman doctrine, a QME may use an alternative rating method from within the AMA Guides if they explain why the standard method does not accurately describe your impairment. The DEU now issues both a standard rating and an alternative rating when applicable, letting the judge consider both. DWC FAQs on the PDRS (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html).

Apportionment: Dividing Disability Between Causes

Apportionment means dividing your disability between work-related and non-work-related causes. If the QME finds that part of your disability existed before your work injury or comes from a non-work cause, that portion may be subtracted from your final disability award. Cal. Lawyers Ass'n – How to Analyze Apportionment (https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/).

Key rules about apportionment:

- The QME must explain the medical basis for any apportionment percentage. A bare statement like "30% is pre-existing" without explanation is not valid.
- A pre-existing condition does not have to have caused symptoms before your injury to justify apportionment. A latent condition (one you did not know about, like underlying arthritis) can be a basis for apportionment if it contributes to your current disability.
- However, apportionment to mere risk factors is not allowed under Cal. Lab. Code § 4663 (https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/). A condition must actually cause part of your disability, not just make injury more likely.

Part 6: Serving QME Reports and Meeting Deadlines

This section covers the strict rules about how and when QME reports must be delivered to all parties.

Report Completion Deadline

The QME must complete and serve the report within 30 days after examining you. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 38 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html).

If the QME misses this deadline without getting an approved extension:

- Either side may request a replacement QME.
- Neither side has to pay for the evaluation unless both sides agree in writing to accept the late report.

Extension Rules

A QME may request extra time by submitting QME Form 112 to the Medical Director, you, and the claims administrator at least 5 days before the 30-day deadline runs out. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 38 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html).

- Up to 30 extra days may be granted if the doctor is waiting for test results or consulting physician reports.
- Up to 15 extra days may be granted for good cause (medical emergency, death in family, natural disaster).
- Extensions for "busy schedule" or vacation are routinely denied. DaisyBill – QME Report Filing Under DWC Scrutiny (https://kb.daisybill.com/articles/qme-report-filing-under-dwc-scrutiny).

For supplemental reports (follow-up reports addressing new questions or information), the deadline is 60 days from the date of the written request, with up to 30 additional days by party agreement. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 38 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html).

Service Requirements by Case Type

Represented cases: The QME must serve the report on you, your attorney, and the claims administrator, attaching QME Form 122 (Declaration of Service). QME Form 122 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm122.pdf); Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 36 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html).

Unrepresented cases (no permanent disability issue): The QME serves the report on you and the claims administrator with QME Form 111 (Findings Summary Form) attached. QME Form 111 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm111.pdf).

Unrepresented cases (permanent disability is at issue): The QME must serve additional forms to the Disability Evaluation Unit (DEU) having jurisdiction over your area of residence:

- QME Form 111
- DWC-AD Form 100 (Employee's Disability Questionnaire)
- DWC-AD Form 101 (Request for Summary Rating Determination)
- Appropriate separator sheets (DWC-CA Form 10232.2)

> ***Critical: Failure to properly serve these documents can make the report inadmissible or cause significant delays in getting your permanent disability rating.***

Part 7: Communication Rules and the Ban on Ex Parte Contact

This section explains the strict rules about communicating with the QME doctor.

What Is an Ex Parte Communication?

An ex parte communication is any contact with the QME doctor that happens without the other side knowing about it. California law strictly prohibits this for substantive (important, case-related) matters. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 35 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html); Bradford & Barthel LLP – A Checklist for Communications with the QME (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/10/06/a-checklist-for-communications-with-the-qme/).

The Rules

- Before the evaluation: All communications with the QME must be in writing and served on the opposing party 20 days before the evaluation date.
- After the evaluation: Any communication with the QME must be in writing and a copy must be sent to the other side at the same time.
- Allowed verbal contact: You may communicate orally with the QME only about non-substantive matters — scheduling, missed appointments, whether records were received, and when the report will be available.

What You Must Provide to the QME

Both sides must provide the following to the evaluator at the same time (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 35 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html)):

- All treating physician records
- Other relevant medical records
- For treatment disputes: the doctor's treatment recommendation and the claims administrator's decision with supporting documents

Consequences of Violating the Rule

If one side communicates with the QME in a way that violates these rules, the other side may:

- End the evaluation and request a new QME panel, or
- Continue with the same QME, accepting that the process was flawed.

The party that violated the rule may be required to pay for the evaluation even if the report cannot be used as evidence.

Part 8: Evidence Standards — Will the Report Hold Up?

This section explains what makes a QME report legally valid and how to challenge a report you believe is wrong.

The Substantial Evidence Standard

For a QME report to carry legal weight, it must constitute substantial evidence — enough relevant evidence that a reasonable person would accept it as adequate to support the conclusion. BPK Firm – What Constitutes Substantial Medical Evidence (https://bpkfirm.com/what-constitutes-substantial-medical-evidence-in-california-lc-4628/); Work Injury Law Center – Understanding Substantial Evidence (https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/).

A report meets this standard when it:

- Is based on an adequate medical history and examination
- Uses the correct legal standards
- Addresses all specific issues in dispute
- Provides detailed reasoning supporting each conclusion

When a Report Is Inadmissible

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 4628(e) (https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf), a report that fundamentally fails to comply with the 15 mandatory elements is inadmissible — it cannot be used as evidence at all, and no one has to pay for it.

Under Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 10682(c) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html), lesser deficiencies do not automatically make a report inadmissible but will reduce how much weight the judge gives it.

Common Grounds for Challenging a Report

You may object to a QME report if it:

- Is based on an inadequate medical history or physical examination
- Uses the wrong legal standard (for example, demanding scientific certainty instead of reasonable medical probability)
- Contains only conclusions without supporting reasoning
- Fails to address all disputed issues
- Comes from an evaluator who shows bias — predetermined beliefs about certain conditions or refusal to apply legal standards consistently. Bradford & Barthel LLP – Removing a QME for Bias (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/).

What Happens When You Object

When a judge finds a report does not meet minimum standards, the judge must first consider whether the problems can be fixed through supplemental reporting. Only if the problems cannot be fixed should the judge consider excluding the report or replacing the QME. This approach follows the analysis established in Sedalia v. Searcy, WCAB Panel Decision (2025) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Sedalia-SEARCY-ADJ14483830.pdf).

Part 9: The Disability Evaluation Unit and Your Rating

This section explains how your QME report gets converted into a disability rating that determines your benefits.

How the DEU Processes Your Rating

After a QME report finds you have permanent disability, the Disability Evaluation Unit (DEU) calculates your final permanent disability rating. DWC Disability Evaluation Unit (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html). The DEU applies the Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf) using these factors:

- Your whole person impairment (WPI) percentage from the AMA Guides
- Adjustments for your age and occupation
- Any apportionment found by the QME
- The applicable adjustment factor (1.4 for injuries on or after January 1, 2013)

The DEU may issue both a standard AMA Guides rating and an Almaraz/Guzman alternative rating, giving the judge both perspectives. DWC FAQs on the PDRS (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html).

Types of DEU Ratings

The DEU issues three types of ratings:

- Summary ratings — for unrepresented workers when no application has been filed
- Consultative ratings — for represented workers or workers who filed applications on their own
- Formal ratings — based on a judge's instructions after a hearing

Requesting Reconsideration

If you believe the DEU made an error in calculating your rating or that the QME report contained factual errors, you may request reconsideration from the DEU with supporting documentation. DWC Guidebook for Injured Workers – Chapter 7 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf).

Part 10: Recent Legal Developments (2024–2026)

This section summarizes recent changes to the law and regulations that affect QME reports.

New Continuing Education Requirements (Effective April 1, 2026)

New Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 55.1 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-11.html) increases continuing education requirements for QMEs from 12 hours to 16 hours over each 24-month period, with mandatory minimums in specific areas:

- 4 hours of disability impairment rating instruction
- 3 hours of medical-legal report writing
- 2 hours of anti-bias training
- 2 hours of workers' compensation case law review
- 1 hour of fee schedule or regulatory compliance instruction

QMEs applying for reappointment on or after April 1, 2026 must meet these enhanced requirements. United Medical Evaluators – Maintaining Your QME Appointment (https://www.unitedmedicalevaluators.com/qme-insights/maintaining-your-qme-appointment).

Updated Medical Fee Schedule (Effective March 1, 2026)

The DWC updated the Official Medical Fee Schedule to reflect a 2.7% Medicare Economic Index inflation factor and a temporary 2.5% increase in the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule. DWC Fee Schedule Adjustments Notice (https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-16.html).

Key Court Decisions

- Reasonable medical probability standard: In Wies v. State of California (2024), the WCAB instructed that QMEs must apply the legal standard of "reasonable medical probability" — not the stricter scientific standard of statistical certainty. Doctors must use clinical judgment and review all evidence, not demand research-level proof. Yrulegui & Roberts (https://www.rjylaw.com/when-medical-opinions-fall-short-wcab-emphasizes-proper-standards-in-workers-compensation-cases/).
- Scheduling delays: In Vazquez v. Ceja Vineyards (2024 en banc), the WCAB held that failure to schedule a QME appointment within regulatory timeframes does not automatically entitle a party to a replacement panel. The WCAB has discretion based on the circumstances. Sullivan on Comp (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/special-report-wcab-en-banc-holds-replacement-panel-not-automatic-for-failure-to-timely-schedule-an-evaluation).
- QME bias: Courts continue to hold that QMEs who hold predetermined views or refuse to apply legal standards like Almaraz/Guzman may be removed for violating the neutrality requirement of Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 41(c)(4) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/41.html). Bradford & Barthel LLP (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/).

Part 11: What to Do About an Unfavorable QME Report

This section explains your options when you receive a QME report that hurts your case.

Your Four Options

When you receive an unfavorable QME report, you can:

1. Accept the report and use it as the basis for settlement negotiations or hearing.
2. Request a supplemental report asking the QME to address specific deficiencies or consider new evidence.
3. Challenge the report at trial through cross-examination and contradictory medical evidence.
4. Seek replacement of the QME based on demonstrable bias or fundamental deficiency.

When to Request a Supplemental Report

Requesting a supplemental report may be appropriate when:

- The report is otherwise adequate but misses a specific medical condition
- New diagnostic test results become available

- You want the doctor to respond to specific criticism about their methodology
- You were in severe pain or unable to communicate well during the original exam

> ***Note: A supplemental report adds 60 days to your timeline and may not change the outcome. Be specific about what you want the doctor to address.***

When to Challenge at Trial

You may challenge a report at trial when:

- The report has arguable deficiencies but is not completely inadmissible
- You have other medical evidence that contradicts the QME's opinions
- Skilled cross-examination can expose weaknesses in the doctor's reasoning

When to Seek QME Replacement

Seek replacement only when:

- The evaluator holds predetermined positions that prevent fair analysis
- The examination was so inadequate that no valid conclusion can be drawn from it
- The report fundamentally violates Cal. Lab. Code § 4628 requirements

> ***Important: Judges are reluctant to disqualify evaluators without clear evidence of bias or fundamental defect. You need strong factual and legal support for this approach.***

How QME Reports Affect Settlement

Insurance companies rely heavily on QME opinions to set their settlement offers. A favorable QME finding of industrial causation can mean the difference between a denied claim and one worth significant benefits. The permanent disability rating in a QME report translates directly into dollar amounts through the Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf).

Part 12: Ethical Rules for QME Doctors

This section explains the professional conduct standards that QME doctors must follow.

What the Law Requires

Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 41 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/41.html) establishes ethical requirements for all QMEs:

- QMEs must maintain a clean, professional office with functioning equipment appropriate to their specialty.
- QMEs cannot refuse to schedule your appointment based on whether you have a lawyer or based on whether payment is guaranteed before the evaluation.
- QMEs cannot request unnecessary exams or procedures.
- QMEs cannot treat injured workers or try to sell them medical treatment or supplies.
- QMEs must communicate with you in a respectful, courteous, and professional manner.
- QMEs must render opinions without regard to your race, sex, national origin, religion, or sexual preference.
- All conclusions must be based on facts and the evaluator's training and knowledge, without bias for or against either side.
- QMEs cannot accept payment contingent on writing an opinion unfavorable to any party.
- All medical discussion in the report must be written by the signing doctor. If multiple doctors sign a report, each must identify the portions they performed and wrote.

Reappointment and Compliance

QMEs serve two-year terms and must apply for reappointment. As part of this process, they must submit their two most recent medical-legal reports through a DWC online portal to demonstrate compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements. DWC QME Process (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html); DWC FAQs on QMEs for Physicians (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/faqphys.html).

Failure to maintain compliance — including timely report submission, proper service on all parties, and substantive quality — can result in denial of reappointment or disciplinary action, including loss of QME status.

References

1. What Is A QME In California Workers' Compensation? – Plaintiff's Injury Law. https://www.pi.law/blog/what-is-a-qme-in-california-workers-compensation-and-how-it-can-make-or-break-your-case/ (https://www.pi.law/blog/what-is-a-qme-in-california-workers-compensation-and-how-it-can-make-or-break-your-case/)

2. QME Report Requirements in California – Sound Medical Evaluators. https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-report-requirements-california/ (https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-report-requirements-california/)

3. QME Form 111: Findings Summary Form (Unrepresented Cases Only) – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm111.pdf (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm111.pdf)

4. DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html)

5. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 36 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html) – Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports – State of California Code of Regulations.

6. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 30 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html) – QME Panel Requests – State of California Code of Regulations.

7. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.2 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-2-panel-qme-process-represented-workers/) – Panel QME Process for Represented Workers – Employees First Labor Law.

8. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 35.5 (https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/8-CCR-35.5) – Compliance by AMEs and QMEs with Administrative Director Evaluation and Reporting Guidelines – Cornell Law School.

9. QME Report Filing Under DWC Scrutiny – DaisyBill. https://kb.daisybill.com/articles/qme-report-filing-under-dwc-scrutiny (https://kb.daisybill.com/articles/qme-report-filing-under-dwc-scrutiny)

10. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 38 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html) – Medical Evaluation Time Frames; Extensions for QMEs and AMEs – State of California Code of Regulations.

11. QME Form 122: AME or QME Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm122.pdf (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm122.pdf)

12. A Guidebook for Injured Workers – Chapter 7: Permanent Disability Benefits – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf (https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf)

13. DWC FAQs on the Permanent Disability Rating Schedule for Practitioners – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deufaq.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deufaq.html)

14. How to Analyze Apportionment – California Lawyers Association. https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/ (https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/)

15. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.1 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-1-panel-qme-process-unrepresented-workers/) – Panel QME Process for Unrepresented Workers – Employees First Labor Law.

16. Cal. Lab. Code § 4060 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74060-medical-evaluations-fo-denied-claims/) – Medical Evaluations for Denied Claims – Employees First Labor Law.

17. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/) – Objections to Medical Determinations – Employees First Labor Law.

18. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 41 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/41.html) – Ethical Requirements for QMEs – State of California Code of Regulations.

19. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 10682 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html) – Physicians' Reports as Evidence – State of California Code of Regulations.

20. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 35 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html) – Exchange of Information and Ex Parte Communications – State of California Code of Regulations.

21. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 34 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/34.html) – Appointment Notification and Cancellation – State of California Code of Regulations.

22. DWC Online QME Form 106 Panel Request – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/OnlineQMEForm106PanelRequest.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/OnlineQMEForm106PanelRequest.html)

23. DWC Frequently Asked Questions about QME Form 106 – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/FAQs.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/FAQs.html)

24. QME Form 105: Request for Qualified Medical Evaluator Panel (Unrepresented Employee) – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/qmeforms/qmeform105.pdf (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/qmeforms/qmeform105.pdf)

25. A Checklist for Communications with the QME – Bradford & Barthel LLP. https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/10/06/a-checklist-for-communications-with-the-qme/ (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/10/06/a-checklist-for-communications-with-the-qme/)

26. Removing a QME for Bias – Bradford & Barthel LLP. https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/ (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/)

27. Cal. Lab. Code § 4628 (https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf) – Comprehensive Medical-Legal Reports – California Organization of Attorneys.

28. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.2 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2) – Represented Employee QME Selection – Justia.

29. What Constitutes Substantial Medical Evidence in California (LC 4628) – BPK Firm. https://bpkfirm.com/what-constitutes-substantial-medical-evidence-in-california-lc-4628/ (https://bpkfirm.com/what-constitutes-substantial-medical-evidence-in-california-lc-4628/)

30. Understanding Substantial Evidence in Workers' Comp Cases – Work Injury Law Center. https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/ (https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/)

31. Steps to Prevent and Combat a Poorly Written Medical-Legal Report – LFLM LLP. https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/steps-to-prevent-and-combat-a-poorly-written-medical-legal-report/ (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/steps-to-prevent-and-combat-a-poorly-written-medical-legal-report/)

32. Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) – Workers' Comp – Employees First Labor Law. https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/ (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/)

33. Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (PDRS) – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf)

34. DWC Disability Evaluation Unit – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html)

35. A Critical Assessment of "Vocational Apportionment" – PBW Law. https://www.pbw-law.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/ArticleonVocationalApportionment.pdf (https://www.pbw-law.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/ArticleonVocationalApportionment.pdf)

36. WCAB En Banc Holds Replacement Panel Not Automatic for Failure to Timely Schedule an Evaluation – Sullivan on Comp. https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/special-report-wcab-en-banc-holds-replacement-panel-not-automatic-for-failure-to-timely-schedule-an-evaluation (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/special-report-wcab-en-banc-holds-replacement-panel-not-automatic-for-failure-to-timely-schedule-an-evaluation)

37. QME Selection If a Party Fails to Timely Strike – Sullivan on Comp. https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/qme-selection-if-a-party-fails-to-timely-strike (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/qme-selection-if-a-party-fails-to-timely-strike)

38. WCAB Emphasizes Proper Standards in Workers' Compensation Cases – Yrulegui & Roberts. https://www.rjylaw.com/when-medical-opinions-fall-short-wcab-emphasizes-proper-standards-in-workers-compensation-cases/ (https://www.rjylaw.com/when-medical-opinions-fall-short-wcab-emphasizes-proper-standards-in-workers-compensation-cases/)

39. Maintaining Your QME Appointment – United Medical Evaluators. https://www.unitedmedicalevaluators.com/qme-insights/maintaining-your-qme-appointment (https://www.unitedmedicalevaluators.com/qme-insights/maintaining-your-qme-appointment)

40. DWC Posts Adjustments to Official Medical Fee Schedule for Physician and Non-Physician Practitioner Services – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation.

https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-16.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-16.html)

41. New QME Process Regulation Section 55.1 in Effect on April 1, 2026 – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-11.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-11.html)

42. Almaraz/Guzman Ratings – Fundamentals of the Case. https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf (https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf)

43. DWC FAQs on QMEs for Physicians – State of California Division of Workers' Compensation. https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/faqphys.html (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/faqphys.html)

44. Sedalia v. Searcy – Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Panel Decision (2025). https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Sedalia-SEARCY-ADJ14483830.pdf (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Sedalia-SEARCY-ADJ14483830.pdf)

California Workers' Compensation Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Reports: A Legal Analysis

(PART-B LEGAL ANALYSIS)

Generated by: Legal AI Assistant

Facilitated by: The Law Offices of Fernando Hidalgo, Inc.

March 1, 2026

The information provided through this AI-powered Analysis is for **general informational and educational purposes only**. It is **not legal advice**, does **not create an attorney-client relationship**, and should not be relied upon as a substitute for advice from a qualified attorney.
Laws and legal outcomes vary based on specific facts and jurisdiction. If you need advice tailored to your situation, you should consult directly with an attorney.

California Workers' Compensation Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Reports: A Comprehensive Legal Analysis

Executive Summary

A Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) report is an independent medical-legal evaluation issued by a state-certified physician when disputes arise in California workers' compensation cases regarding medical issues that cannot be resolved through agreement between the injured worker and the insurance carrier.[1][3][1] These reports serve as critical evidence in workers' compensation proceedings and frequently determine the trajectory and ultimate resolution of claims. The QME process is governed by a complex statutory framework under California Labor Code sections 4060, 4061, 4062, 4062.1, and 4062.2, implemented through detailed regulations in California Code of Regulations Title 8, sections 1 through 159.[1][2][44] QME reports must comply with strict substantive and procedural requirements to constitute legally sufficient evidence, and failure to meet these requirements can result in supplemental reporting, litigation delays, credibility challenges, or even exclusion from evidence. This comprehensive analysis examines the legal framework governing QME reports in California workers' compensation, the procedural mechanisms for obtaining evaluations, the substantive content and compliance standards required, and the strategic considerations parties must evaluate when preparing for, requesting, or challenging QME reports.

Key Risk Assessment: The adequacy of a QME report directly impacts claim outcomes. A well-prepared and accurate QME report significantly strengthens a party's legal position and settlement leverage, while an incomplete or inadequately reasoned report creates substantial evidentiary vulnerabilities. For injured workers, an unfavorable QME report can result in claim denial, reduced permanent disability ratings, or termination of treatment authorization. For employers and insurers, a poorly reasoned report failing to address contested issues may be subject to challenge, requiring supplemental evaluation and delaying case resolution. Likelihood of legal sufficiency is HIGH to MEDIUM when QME reports fully address all disputed issues, contain complete objective findings, provide detailed medical reasoning, and comply with statutory declaration and service requirements. Likelihood is LOW to MEDIUM when reports contain conclusory language without supporting analysis, rely primarily on subjective complaints without adequate objective findings, or fail to address apportionment, causation, or other contested issues within the evaluator's scope of practice.

Timeline Considerations: The QME process involves multiple critical deadlines. Initial QME panel requests must be submitted at specified times based on the type of dispute and whether the injured worker is represented. Once a panel is issued, the worker (or attorney) typically has 10 days to select a physician and schedule an appointment. The selected QME generally has 30 days from examination to serve the report, with limited extensions available for specific circumstances. Supplemental reports must be completed within 60 days of request. Understanding and meeting these deadlines is essential to preserve legal rights and prevent forfeiture of claims or defenses.

Legal Framework and Statutory Authority

The Statutory Foundation: Labor Code Sections 4060 Through 4062.2

The authority to obtain QME evaluations derives from several interconnected statutes within California's Labor Code that establish the framework for resolving medical disputes in workers' compensation.[1][1][22] Labor Code section 4060 applies to disputes concerning whether an injury is industrial (work-related) and provides the injured worker with the right to request medical evaluation when the employer has denied compensability.[45] Labor Code section 4061 addresses disputes regarding permanent disability and apportionment determinations and requires evaluation when there is disagreement between treating physicians and the insurance carrier regarding the extent of permanent disability or whether disability should be apportioned to non-industrial causes.[15][1] Labor Code section 4062 addresses all other medical disputes not covered by sections 4060 or 4061, including the necessity or scope of medical treatment, authorization for specific procedures or medications, whether the injured worker has reached maximum medical improvement (MMI), and temporary disability status.[22] These three sections establish the substantive triggers for QME evaluation requests.

Labor Code section 4062.1 establishes the procedural framework for obtaining QME panels when an injured worker is not represented by an attorney.[19] This statute requires that when a medical dispute arises under sections 4060, 4061, or 4062, and the worker is unrepresented, the parties must first attempt to agree on a

physician to conduct an independent medical evaluation within 10 days of objection. If agreement cannot be reached, either party may request assignment of a three-member QME panel from the Division of Workers' Compensation Medical Unit.[19] The unrepresented injured worker then has 10 working days to select one physician from the panel, arrange an appointment, and notify the employer. If the worker fails to make this selection within the deadline, the employer may select from the remaining panel members.[19]

Labor Code section 4062.2 establishes a parallel but distinct procedure for represented employees.[7][55] When an injured worker is represented by an attorney, the two parties must first attempt to agree on an Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME) who need not be a QME.[55] This agreement process must occur within 10 days of the first written proposal naming a proposed AME, with an option to extend up to 20 additional days by agreement.[55] If the parties cannot agree on an AME within this period, either party may request a panel of three QMEs from the Medical Unit.[55] Once the panel is issued, the parties must confer and attempt to agree on a physician from the panel within 10 days of assignment.[55] If they reach agreement, that physician becomes the evaluator. If not, each party may strike one name from the three-physician panel within three working days of gaining the right to do so, leaving the remaining physician as the evaluator.[55] If a party fails to timely strike a name, the other party may select any remaining physician to serve as the evaluator.[53] After selection, the represented employee (through counsel) bears responsibility for arranging the appointment within 10 days; if the employee fails to do so, the employer may arrange the appointment.[55]

Labor Code section 139.2 establishes the regulatory framework for QME qualification, appointment, discipline, and compensation.[44] This statute authorizes the Administrative Director to establish qualification standards for QMEs, including education, training, examination, and continuing education requirements.[44] It provides that QME appointments are for two-year terms subject to reappointment, authorizes disciplinary action for non-compliance with evaluation procedures or procedural timelines, and establishes the medical-legal fee schedule for QME compensation.[44]

Labor Code section 4628 establishes the required elements for comprehensive medical-legal reports to constitute admissible evidence in workers' compensation proceedings.[44] This statute requires that medical-legal reports include specific components including date and location of examination, medical history, patient complaints, information relied upon in forming opinions, medical findings, diagnosis, opinion as to nature and extent of disability and work limitations, cause of disability, treatment indicated, and opinion as to whether permanent disability has resulted and whether it is stationary, with description and complete evaluation if stationary.[44] The statute further requires identification of any apportionment of disability and, for psychiatric injuries, determination of the percent of total causation resulting from actual events of employment.[44] Critically, Labor Code section 4628(e) provides that failure to comply with these requirements renders the report inadmissible as evidence and eliminates any liability for payment of medical-legal expenses incurred in connection with the report.[44]

Regulatory Framework: Title 8 California Code of Regulations Sections 1-159

The detailed procedural and substantive requirements for QME practice are implemented through comprehensive regulations in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations.[2][4][5][8][10] These regulations establish the specific procedures and standards that govern all aspects of QME practice and reporting.

Title 8 section 30 governs QME panel requests and establishes distinct procedures for unrepresented versus represented cases.[6][6][6] For unrepresented employees seeking a panel, the requesting party must submit QME Form 105 to the Medical Unit, attaching the claims administrator's denial notice (for section 4060 disputes) or the claims administrator's written objection and description of the disputed determination (for sections 4061 or 4062 disputes).[6][6] The requesting party must also complete a proof of service showing that the form was served on the opposing party by mail or hand delivery.[6] For represented cases, initial panel requests must be submitted online using the DWC internet system, as of October 1, 2015, utilizing QME Form 106, and the requesting party must print and serve a paper copy on the opposing party with proof of service within one working day of generating the panel list online.[26][6]

Title 8 section 34 addresses appointment notification and scheduling requirements.[38] When a QME appointment is made, the QME must complete and serve an Appointment Notification Form (Form 110) on the injured worker and claims administrator, or if none the employer, within 5 business days of the appointment date.[38] In represented cases, the form must also be served on the attorneys for each party if known.[38] The notification must indicate whether a certified interpreter is required and specify the language

needed.[38] Critically, a QME cannot cancel a scheduled appointment less than 6 business days before the appointment date except for good cause, and if cancellation occurs, the QME must reschedule the appointment within 60 calendar days unless the parties agree in writing to extend this deadline.[38] An injured worker is not liable for any missed appointment fee when the appointment is cancelled for good cause.[38]

Title 8 section 35 establishes requirements for exchange of information and prohibits ex parte (one-sided) communications with evaluators.[27][30] The claims administrator and injured worker must provide specified information to the evaluator simultaneously, including all treating physician records, other relevant medical records, and for treatment disputes, the physician's report recommending treatment and the claims administrator's decision with supporting documents.[27] Critically, the regulation provides that all communications with the evaluator must be in writing and served on the opposing party when sent to the evaluator, and that oral or written communications may occur only regarding non-substantive matters such as scheduling, missed appointments, furnishing records, and report availability.[27][30] Violation of these ex parte communication requirements can result in the aggrieved party obtaining a new panel or electing to proceed with the original evaluator.[27]

Title 8 section 35.5 establishes compliance requirements for evaluators with Administrative Director guidelines and specifies that QMEs and AMEs must address all contested medical issues within their scope of practice and areas of clinical competence.[8] The evaluator must state in the report the date the examination was completed and the street address where performed, and if the report is signed on a different date than the examination, must identify both dates.[8] The evaluator must advise parties in writing of any disputed issues outside the evaluator's scope of practice at the earliest opportunity and no later than when the report is served.[8] For panel QMEs, a copy of this notification must be sent to the Medical Director, and only a party's written request for an additional panel with this notice attached will trigger issuance of an additional panel by the Medical Director.[8]

Title 8 section 36 specifies service requirements for comprehensive medical-legal reports.[5][30][5] When the injured worker is represented, the QME must serve the report on the worker, the worker's attorney, and the claims administrator or employer by completing QME Form 122 (Declaration of Service) and attaching it to the report.[5][30][5] When the worker is unrepresented and the report addresses only disputed issues outside the scope of section 4061 (permanent disability/apportionment), the QME must serve the report with QME Form 111 (Findings Summary Form) completed and attached on the injured worker and claims administrator or employer.[5][30] When an unrepresented worker's report addresses permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment, the QME must also serve the completed QME Form 111, the DWC-AD Form 100 (Employee's Disability Questionnaire), and the DWC-AD Form 101 (Request for Summary Rating Determination) to the Disability Evaluation Unit having jurisdiction over the employee's area of residence.[5][30]

Title 8 section 38 establishes strict timelines for QME report completion.[10][32][10] An initial or follow-up comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report must be prepared and served within 30 days after the QME has seen the employee or commenced the comprehensive medical-legal evaluation procedure.[10][32][10] If the evaluator fails to meet this deadline without obtaining approved extension, either party may request a QME replacement, and neither party bears liability for payment of the evaluation unless both parties waive the right to a new evaluation and elect to accept the late report in writing.[10][32][10] Extensions may be requested on QME Form 112 (Time Frame Extension Request), which must be submitted to the Medical Director, injured worker, and claims administrator no later than 5 days before the initial deadline expires.[10][32] Extensions for waiting on test results or consulting physician reports may be granted for up to 30 additional days, and extensions for good cause (medical emergency, bereavement, natural disaster) may be granted for up to 15 additional days.[10][32] For supplemental reports, the deadline is 60 days from the date of written request, with possible extension by agreement of parties up to 30 additional days.[10][32]

Title 8 section 41 establishes comprehensive ethical requirements for all QMEs.[23] QMEs must maintain a clean, professional medical office with functioning instruments and equipment appropriate to evaluations within their scope of practice, and must maintain a functioning business phone listed with the Medical Director.[23] QMEs cannot refuse to schedule appointments based on whether the worker is represented or unrepresented or based on whether reimbursement is promised before evaluation.[23] QMEs cannot request unnecessary exams or procedures, must refrain from treating injured workers or soliciting to provide medical treatment or supplies, and must communicate with injured workers in a respectful, courteous, and professional

manner.[23] Importantly, QMEs must render expert opinions without regard to the injured worker's race, sex, national origin, religion, or sexual preference, and conclusions must be based on facts and the evaluator's training and specialty-based knowledge and must be without bias either for or against the injured worker or the claims administrator.[23] QMEs cannot refuse compensation contingent on writing an opinion unfavorable to any party.[23] All portions of the report containing discussion of medical issues must be written by the signing physician, and where multiple physicians sign a single report, each must clearly state the portions they performed and drafted.[23]

Current Legal Landscape and Recent Developments

Recent Regulatory and Policy Updates (January 2026 Through March 2026)

The Division of Workers' Compensation has implemented significant regulatory changes affecting QME practice and procedure that became or will become effective in early 2026.[70] Effective April 1, 2026, new regulation section 55.1 substantially increases continuing education requirements for QMEs seeking reappointment.[36][70] Rather than the previous 12-hour requirement over 24 months, QMEs must now complete 16 hours of continuing education within the 24-month period preceding reappointment, with mandated minimums in specific content areas.[36][70] These required minimums include a minimum of 4 hours of instruction in disability impairment rating, a minimum of 3 hours of instruction in medical-legal report writing, a minimum of 2 hours of anti-bias training, a minimum of 2 hours of review of workers' compensation case law, and a minimum of 1 hour of instruction in proper application of the medical-legal fee schedule or QME adherence to regulatory clerical requirements.[36][70] Additionally, QMEs may earn a maximum of 2 hours of continuing education credit by having their reports reviewed by an approved educational provider.[36][70] Approved educational providers must meet these specifications, and QMEs applying for reappointment on or after April 1, 2026 must demonstrate full compliance with these enhanced requirements.[36][70]

Additionally, in early 2026, the DWC implemented adjustments to the Official Medical Fee Schedule for physician and non-physician practitioner services effective March 1, 2026, reflecting updated Medicare payment system changes, relative value units, and Current Procedural Terminology coding requirements.[67] These adjustments include updated conversion factors accounting for a 2.7% Medicare Economic Index inflation factor and a temporary 2.5% increase in the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule.[67] While not directly affecting QME evaluation procedures, these fee schedule changes may influence the economic feasibility of QME evaluations and the allocation of medical-legal expenses in settled cases.

Key Appellate Decisions on QME Report Standards

California appellate courts and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board have developed substantial precedent establishing the legal standards that QME reports must satisfy to constitute admissible evidence. The concept of "substantial evidence" is central to this framework. Substantial evidence means evidence that is sufficient in character, weight, and amount to support the conclusion and such that a reasonable mind might accept it as adequate to support a conclusion.[33][65] For a QME report to constitute substantial evidence, it must be based on an adequate medical history and examination, utilize correct legal theories, and address the specific issues presented to the evaluator.[41] Courts have repeatedly emphasized that medical-legal reports grounded in inadequate examination or relying on inadequate medical history cannot constitute substantial evidence.[41]

A critical recent development regarding permanent disability rating standards involves the Almaraz/Guzman doctrine, which establishes that the Permanent Disability Rating Schedule is prima facie evidence (presumed correct) but is rebuttable by substantial evidence of a different rating that more accurately describes impairment.[13][37] Under this framework, physicians may provide an alternative rating using any chapter, table, or method within the four corners of the AMA Guides if they can explain why a strict application of the standard rating schedule does not accurately assess impairment.[13][37] However, alternative ratings cannot be based on an attempt to replicate work restrictions from the prior 1997 rating schedule or on impermissible factors such as pain alone or subjective complaints without adequate objective findings.[13][37] The Disability Evaluation Unit now issues both a standard AMA Guides rating and an Almaraz/Guzman alternative rating whenever applicable, allowing the Workers' Compensation Judge to evaluate both approaches.[13][13]

Regarding bias and neutrality, the California Court of Appeal has established that QMEs who hold predetermined beliefs or predispositions regarding certain medical conditions or rating methodologies are subject to replacement for violating the requirement that all conclusions be rendered without bias.[21] In cases where QMEs have stated they will never apply Almaraz/Guzman or will never find certain conditions to be work-related regardless of facts, courts have found this violates section 41(c)(4) of Title 8 and requires replacement of the evaluator.[21] The principle underlying these decisions is that QMEs must maintain genuine neutrality and be willing to apply legal standards and medical principles consistently across cases rather than maintaining inflexible positions that prevent objective analysis.[21]

A significant 2024 development, reflected in the Board's decision in Wies v. State of California, emphasizes that medical opinions in workers' compensation cases must be grounded in the legal standard of "reasonable medical probability" rather than the scientific standard of statistical certainty.[68] The WCAB has instructed that QMEs must reassess causation under the appropriate legal standard when reports rely too heavily on scientific studies with stricter statistical thresholds, utilizing clinical judgment and a holistic review of all evidence rather than demanding statistical significance beyond what workers' compensation law requires.[68]

Regarding procedural requirements, the WCAB's 2024 en banc decision in Vazquez v. Ceja Vineyards clarified that although California Code of Regulations section 31.3(e) and 31.5(a)(2) establish timeframes for QME availability to schedule appointments (90-120 days depending on circumstances), failure to schedule within these timeframes does not automatically entitle a party to a replacement panel.[48] Rather, the WCAB has discretion to order replacement based on equitable considerations, and a WCJ is unlikely to replace a QME based merely on scheduling delays if the evaluator has issued prior reports and the delay is short, but more likely to do so if the initial evaluation cannot be scheduled until long after the applicable deadline and a replacement QME can schedule promptly.[48]

Practice Advisory Notes on Current Implementation

As of March 2026, the California practice regarding QME reports reflects a system increasingly focused on ensuring compliance with statutory requirements and preventing delays through timely reporting and completion of mandatory forms.[9][2][47] The DWC Medical Unit has issued warnings to QMEs and AMEs regarding "possible enforcement actions" for failure to serve medical-legal reports in timely manner, with non-compliance constituting grounds for disciplinary action including loss of QME status.[9][2] The Division emphasizes that only medical emergencies, bereavement, and natural disasters meet the criteria for "good cause" extensions, and many evaluators are being advised that extensions for vague reasons such as "busy schedule" are routinely denied.[9][2]

Current practice also reflects heightened scrutiny of QME report completeness. The Disability Evaluation Unit has indicated that supplemental reports are frequently requested when initial QME reports fail to address all disputed issues, fail to clearly explain apportionment analysis, lack detailed reasoning supporting impairment ratings, omit identification of records reviewed, or provide conclusory opinions without adequate medical explanation.[13][2] To minimize supplemental reporting delays, practitioners and QMEs are advised to utilize structured reporting checklists ensuring all disputed issues are addressed, all records reviewed are clearly identified, and every conclusion includes supporting medical reasoning rather than conclusory language.[2]

Procedural Mechanisms: From Dispute to Evaluation

Triggering Events and Timing Requirements

The initiation of a QME evaluation depends on which statutory section governs the disputed issue and whether the injured worker is represented by counsel. For section 4060 disputes (compensability/whether injury is work-related), the timeline begins with the claims administrator's written denial or request for examination to determine compensability.[6][5][6] The injured worker (or if unrepresented, the claims administrator) may request a QME panel, but only within the context of a compensability dispute and with evidence that the claims administrator provided the injured worker with notice of the right to request evaluation using the prescribed form.[6]

For section 4061 disputes (permanent disability and apportionment), the timeline begins when a treating physician or QME/AME report finds permanent disability but the claims administrator or injured worker objects to the determination.[6][5] The objecting party must send written notice of objection identifying the

treating physician, the date of the report being objected to, and a description of the specific medical determination requiring resolution through comprehensive medical-legal evaluation.[6][5] Only after this written objection is sent does the pathway to QME panel selection begin.

For section 4062 disputes (all other medical issues including treatment authorization and MMI determination), similarly, the process begins with written objection to the treating physician's medical determination.[22][5] The treating physician's determination that must be objected to is typically documented in a medical report addressing treatment necessity, MMI status, or other medical issues, and the objection must specify why the party believes the physician's determination is incorrect.[22]

Once a triggering written objection is sent, the timing for QME panel requests differs based on representation status. For unrepresented employees under section 4062.1, either party may request a panel at any time after the objection is communicated to the other party.[19][5] For represented employees under section 4062.2, neither party may request a QME panel earlier than the first working day that is at least 10 days after the date of mailing of the objection.[7][55] This 10-day (plus mailing time) delay is intended to provide an opportunity for the parties to attempt agreement on an Agreed Medical Evaluator without immediate resort to the QME panel process.

Panel Request Procedures: Unrepresented versus Represented Employees

For unrepresented injured workers, panel requests are submitted on the paper form QME Form 105 (Request for Qualified Medical Evaluator Panel - Unrepresented Employee) and mailed to the Division of Workers' Compensation Medical Unit at P.O. Box 71010, Oakland, CA 94612.[6][29][6] The form must include panel request information (date of injury, claim number, requesting party, reason QME panel is being requested, dispute type, name of primary treating physician, date of treating physician's report being objected to, specialty of treating physician, and QME specialty requested), employee information (name, address, telephone number), and employer/claims administrator information (name, address, contact person, phone number).[6][29][6] For section 4060 disputes, the requesting party must attach a copy of the claims administrator's denial notice or request for examination to determine compensability.[6][29][6] For section 4061 or 4062 disputes, if the claiming administrator is the requesting party, it must attach a written objection meeting the specifications above.[6][29][6] The requesting party must also complete a proof of service showing that the form and required attachments were served on the opposing party by mail or hand delivery.[6][29][6]

For represented injured workers, initial QME panel requests for cases with dates of injury on or after January 1, 2005 must be submitted electronically through the DWC internet system using QME Form 106 (Request for Qualified Medical Evaluator Panel - Represented Employee Case) as of October 1, 2015.[26][28][6] The online system is accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week.[5][28] The requesting party completes the form online specifying the elements required (date of injury, claim number, requesting party, reason panel is requested, dispute type, specialty requested, opposing party's preferred specialty if known), and the system immediately generates an online panel number if the request is eligible.[28][6] The requesting party then prints the online request, the panel list, and any supporting documentation and must serve copies on the opposing party with a proof of service within one working day of generating the panel.[5][28]

The online system will reject panel requests if a panel has already been issued in the case and injured worker, if the request is deemed premature (fewer than 16 calendar days have elapsed since the objection was mailed to the opposing party; the system requires at least 10 days plus 5 days for mailing), or if there are insufficient QMEs in the requested specialty.[28][6] If a request is rejected as premature or ineligible, the requesting party is not required to serve the rejection notice but must serve the parties when an eligible panel is ultimately generated.

QME Panel Selection Process

Once a QME panel is issued by the Medical Unit, the selection process differs significantly based on representation status. For unrepresented employees under section 4062.1, the injured worker has 10 working days from issuance of the panel to select a physician, arrange an appointment, and notify the employer of both the selection and appointment.[19][6] If the employee fails to perform these tasks within 10 days, the employer may select any remaining physician and schedule the appointment on its own.[19] This deadline is critical because loss of it results in loss of control over QME selection.

For represented employees under section 4062.2, the process involves two stages of potential agreement followed by striking if necessary.[55] Within 10 days of panel assignment, the parties must confer and attempt to agree upon a physician from the panel.[55] If agreement is reached within this period, that physician becomes the evaluator. If the parties do not agree within 10 days, each party may then strike one name from the three-person panel within three working days of gaining the right to do so.[55] The remaining physician automatically becomes the evaluator. If a party fails to exercise its strike within three working days, the other party may select any physician remaining on the panel to serve as the evaluator.[53][55] After the physician is selected (either by agreement or as the remaining panel member after striking), the represented employee (through counsel) is responsible for arranging the appointment within 10 days after selection and notifying the employer of the appointment.[55] If the employee fails to arrange and notify within 10 days, the employer may arrange the appointment and notify the employee.[55]

QME Appointment and Interview Process

Once a QME is selected, that evaluator must send an Appointment Notification Form (Form 110) to all parties within 5 business days of the appointment being made.[28][38] The notification must include the date, time, and location of the appointment, whether a certified interpreter is required and what language, and any other relevant information per the form's requirements.[28][38] The QME must schedule the first appointment at a medical office listed on the panel selection form or any office listed with the Medical Director if the parties agree in writing to a different location.[28][38] Subsequent follow-up evaluations may be conducted at another medical office of the same QME if it is listed with the Medical Director and is within reasonable geographic distance from the injured worker's residence.[28][38]

An injured worker cannot unilaterally refuse to attend the QME appointment, though California law provides limited circumstances under which cancellation is permitted.[28][38] A party may cancel an appointment less than 6 business days before the scheduled date only for good cause, and cancellation must be communicated in writing stating the reason, with the cancellation followed by confirmation in writing if made orally.[28][38] An injured worker is not liable for any missed appointment fee when the appointment is cancelled for good cause.[28][38] If a QME cancels the appointment, the QME must reschedule within 60 calendar days unless the parties agree to extend this deadline.[28][38]

Required Content and Compliance Standards for QME Reports

Mandatory Report Elements under Labor Code Section 4628

California Labor Code section 4628 and parallel California Code of Regulations section 10682 establish the mandatory elements that must be included in comprehensive medical-legal reports to constitute admissible evidence.[24][44][24] The statute and regulation list fifteen specific components that should be included "where applicable" in medical reports.[24][44][24] The first element is the date of the examination and the location (street address) where the evaluation was performed.[24][44] This requirement ensures the parties can verify where the evaluation occurred and maintain geographic records of evaluator locations for determining reasonable travel distance for follow-up evaluations.[24]

The second element is a complete history of the injury as reported by the injured worker and as documented in medical records.[24][44] This history must be detailed enough for a reader to understand the mechanism of injury, the circumstances under which the injury occurred, initial symptoms, and how the condition has evolved over time.[24][44] The third element is a listing of all information received in preparation of the report or relied upon in formulating the physician's opinion.[24][44] This is a critical requirement-the report must explicitly identify every medical record, diagnostic study, prior report, work history document, and any other information reviewed, so that the completeness of the evaluation can be assessed.[24][44][41]

The fourth element is the injured worker's medical history, including injuries and conditions and residuals thereof, if any.[24][44] This requires documentation of prior injuries, pre-existing conditions, and comorbidities that may be relevant to apportionment analysis or to understanding the baseline functional status against which the current injury is measured.[24][44] The fifth element is the physician's findings on examination, and these must be objective findings clearly detailed rather than relying primarily on the injured worker's subjective complaints.[24][44][24] Objective findings include range of motion measurements, strength testing, imaging results, diagnostic test results, and other observable clinical findings.[24][44][24]

The sixth element is a formal diagnosis or diagnoses of the injured worker's condition(s).[24][44] The seventh element is the physician's opinion as to the nature, extent, and duration of disability and work limitations if any.[24][44] This requires the evaluator to explain what functional activities are limited and the degree of limitation (e.g., "cannot lift more than 10 pounds," "cannot perform overhead activities"). The eighth element is the physician's opinion regarding the cause of the disability-whether the disability is caused by the industrial injury, is pre-existing and merely aggravated, or results from intervening causes.[24][44]

The ninth element is the physician's recommendation regarding treatment indicated, including past treatment, continuing treatment, and future medical care that may be needed.[24][44] The tenth element is the physician's opinion as to whether permanent disability has resulted from the injury and whether the condition is stationary (permanent and stationary-P&S or maximum medical improvement-MMI).[24][44] If the physician finds that permanent disability has resulted and the condition is stationary, the report must include a description of the disability with a complete evaluation; conclusory statements without detailed functional description are insufficient.[24][44]

The eleventh element is identification of any apportionment of disability and the basis for any apportionment determination.[24][44] If disability is apportioned to pre-existing conditions or non-industrial causes, the report must explain the medical basis for the apportionment and identify what percentage or portion of the disability is attributed to each causal factor.[24][44] The twelfth element, applicable only in psychiatric injury cases, is a determination of the percent of the total causation resulting from actual events of employment.[24][44] For psychiatric injuries, the statute requires identification of what percentage of causation is attributable to work-related stressors versus personal factors.[24][44]

The thirteenth element is the physician's reasons for the opinions expressed in the report.[24][44] This is a foundational requirement-mere conclusions without explanations of their medical basis are insufficient to constitute substantial evidence.[24][44][41] The evaluator must explain the medical reasoning supporting each opinion, including reference to objective findings, diagnostic test results, and medical principles supporting the conclusions.[24][44][41] The fourteenth element is the physician's signature on the report.[24][44] Finally, the fifteenth element is any other information required by the Medical Director or necessary to make the report adequate for workers' compensation purposes.[24][44]

Format and Structural Requirements

California Code of Regulations section 35.5 specifies additional format and structural requirements beyond the substantive elements listed above.[8] Every QME or AME report must state the date the examination was completed and the street address at which the examination was performed.[8] If the evaluator signs the report on a date other than the date the examination was completed, the evaluator must enter the date the report is signed next to or near the signature on the report.[8] This requirement allows readers to determine whether there was a significant delay between the examination and report completion.

The evaluator must address all contested medical issues arising from all injuries reported on one or more claim forms prior to the date of the employee's appointment with the medical evaluator that are issues within the evaluator's scope of practice and areas of clinical competence.[8] The evaluator must attempt to address each question raised by each party in the issue cover letter sent to the evaluator prior to the evaluation.[8][29] For panel QMEs evaluating unrepresented employees, if the evaluator determines that the employee's condition has not become permanent and stationary as of the date of the evaluation, the parties should request any further evaluation from the same QME if the QME is currently active and available, and if the QME is unavailable, a new panel may be issued.[5][30]

An evaluator must advise the parties in writing of any disputed medical issues outside of the evaluator's scope of practice and area of clinical competency at the evaluator's earliest opportunity and no later than the date the report is served, so the parties may initiate the process for obtaining an additional evaluation in another specialty.[8][29] In the case of a panel QME, the evaluator must send a copy of this notification to the Medical Director as well, and only a party's written request for an additional panel with the evaluator's notice attached will trigger the Medical Director's issuance of an additional panel.[8][29]

The Substance of Medical Analysis: Causation, Permanent Disability, and Apportionment

Within the framework of required elements, QME reports must provide substantive medical analysis addressing the specific disputes presented. For causation disputes under section 4060, the evaluator must

analyze whether the documented injury or condition is medically more likely than not to have arisen out of employment and occurred in the course of employment.[2][32][33][68] This analysis requires evaluation of the temporal relationship between employment exposure and symptom onset, the mechanism of injury as related to job duties, and whether the condition is consistent with work-related causation.[68] Current standards require analysis grounded in "reasonable medical probability" rather than scientific certainty, meaning the condition is more likely than not to be work-related, and evaluators must apply clinical judgment holistically rather than demanding statistical significance.[68]

For permanent disability and apportionment disputes under section 4061, the evaluator must determine whether the injured worker has reached permanent and stationary status (or maximum medical improvement), must perform a whole person impairment (WPI) rating using the American Medical Association Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment (AMA Guides), and must analyze whether any portion of the disability should be apportioned to pre-existing conditions or non-industrial causes.[12][13][34][13][37] The AMA Guides methodology and California Permanent Disability Rating Schedule rules must be properly applied.[31][34][13][37] Since 2013, for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2013, the evaluation process utilizes the 2005 or later version of the AMA Guides with a 1.4 modifier (rather than the prior diminished future earning capacity adjustment) and without increases for sleep dysfunction, sexual dysfunction, or psychiatric disorder arising from physical injuries except in specific circumstances.[13][31][13][13]

Apportionment analysis must be grounded in causation, not mere risk factors.[15][59] The evaluator must determine what percentage of the permanent disability is caused by the industrial injury and what percentage, if any, is caused by pre-existing conditions or non-industrial factors that contribute to the current disability.[15][59] Importantly, a pre-existing condition need not have been symptomatic to warrant apportionment; a latent condition (such as underlying osteoarthritis) can be a basis for apportionment if it is contributing to the current disability.[15][59] However, the condition must actually be contributing to the disability, not merely placing the worker at increased risk; apportionment to "risk factors" alone is not permitted.[15][59] When apportioning disability, evaluators may consider using alternative impairment ratings under Almaraz/Guzman methodology if they explain why the standard AMA Guides rating does not accurately describe impairment, provided the alternative rating stays within the four corners of the Guides.[13][37][40]

For medical treatment disputes under section 4062, the evaluator typically addresses whether particular treatments are medically necessary, whether the injured worker has reached MMI such that further curative treatment is no longer appropriate, and whether any work restrictions or functional limitations remain post-treatment.[22][24] Prior to July 1, 2013, QMEs were authorized to opine on the appropriateness of treatment compared to medical treatment utilization schedules, but after that date, QMEs must opine only on whether the injured worker will need future medical care to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury, not on whether specific treatments are appropriate or necessary.[8][29]

Common Deficiencies in QME Reports and Compliance Issues

Despite statutory and regulatory requirements, QME reports frequently contain deficiencies that either render them inadmissible or subject them to challenge and supplemental reporting requests.[2][9][2][41] Common deficiencies include failure to address all disputed issues raised by the parties,[2][2] incomplete apportionment analysis that fails to explain the basis for apportionment percentages,[2][2] lack of reasoning supporting impairment ratings (conclusory statements such as "10% whole person impairment" without explaining how this rating was derived from AMA Guides methodology),[2][2] omission or incomplete identification of records reviewed,[2][2] and provision of conclusory opinions without medical explanation or reference to objective findings.[2][2]

Additionally, some reports improperly rely primarily on subjective complaints from the injured worker without adequate objective findings to support conclusions,[2][2][41] fail to distinguish between objective findings and subjective complaints, contain inconsistent findings (e.g., normal physical examination but opinion of significant disability), inappropriately apply outdated evaluation methodologies, or fail to address causation with sufficient medical reasoning.[2][2][41] Reports that fail to include required declarations under penalty of perjury or that improperly date the report on a date different from the examination without explanation may face admissibility challenges.[8][24][44]

To maintain compliance and minimize supplemental reporting requests, current best practices recommend that QMEs utilize comprehensive evaluation and reporting checklists ensuring all disputed issues are identified and addressed, all records reviewed are explicitly listed, every conclusion includes supporting medical reasoning and reference to objective findings, any apportionment determination includes clear explanation of the percentage attributed to each cause with supporting medical analysis, any impairment rating includes reference to specific AMA Guides tables and methodologies used, dates of examination and report signing are clearly identified, and the report is completed and submitted within the required 30-day timeline.[2][9][2][47]

Service Requirements, Communication Restrictions, and Ex Parte Communications

Mandatory Service Requirements and Timing

After a comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report is completed, it must be served on the parties in compliance with strict statutory and regulatory requirements.[5][5][30][5] For represented cases, the evaluator must serve the report on the injured worker, the injured worker's attorney, and the claims administrator (or if none, the employer) by completing QME Form 122 (Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report) and attaching it to the report.[5][5][30][5] The report must be served within 30 days of the date the QME saw the employee or commenced the evaluation procedure.[10][32][10]

For unrepresented cases, service requirements depend on the scope of the report. If the report addresses only disputed issues outside the scope of section 4061 (permanent disability/apportionment), the QME must serve the report with QME Form 111 (Findings Summary Form-Unrepresented Cases Only) completed and attached, serving both the injured worker and the claims administrator or employer.[5][5][30] If the report for an unrepresented worker addresses permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment, the QME must serve not only the report with QME Form 111 but also the DWC-AD Form 100 (Employee's Disability Questionnaire), the DWC-AD Form 101 (Request for Summary Rating Determination), and appropriate separator sheets (DWC-CA Form 10232.2), all of which must be served to the Disability Evaluation Unit office having jurisdiction over the employee's area of residence in addition to service on the worker and claims administrator.[5][5][30] Compliance with these service requirements is mandatory, and failure to comply can result in the report being deemed inadmissible or create grounds for QME replacement.[5][5][30]

The 30-day timeline for initial report submission is strict and enforceable.[9][10][32][10] If a QME fails to serve the report within 30 days without having obtained prior approval for an extension, either party may request a replacement QME, and neither party bears liability for payment of the evaluation unless both parties in writing waive the right to a new evaluation and elect to accept the late report.[10][32][10] Extensions must be requested on QME Form 112 (QME/AME Time Frame Extension Request) and must be submitted to the Medical Director, injured worker, and claims administrator at least 5 days before the initial deadline expires.[10][32] The Medical Director then notifies the evaluator and parties whether the extension is granted.[10][32] If extension is denied, the Medical Director sends the parties a notice allowing them to indicate whether they will accept the late report.[10][32]

For supplemental reports (reports completing analysis initiated in an earlier evaluation), the timeline is 60 days from the date of written request from a party, with possible extension by agreement of the parties up to 30 additional days without requiring Medical Director approval.[10][32][10] A supplemental report request must be accompanied by any new medical records that were unavailable at the time of the original evaluation and which have been properly served on the opposing party.[10][32]

Prohibition on Ex Parte Communications

One of the most important and frequently violated requirements in the QME process is the prohibition on ex parte communications with evaluators.[27][30] Labor Code section 4062.3(e) explicitly provides that all communications with a medical evaluator before a medical evaluation shall be in writing and shall be served on the opposing party 20 days in advance of the evaluation.[27][30] Any subsequent communication with the medical evaluator shall be in writing and shall be served on the opposing party when sent to the medical evaluator.[27][30] A critical exception permits oral or written communications regarding non-substantive matters such as scheduling of appointments, missed appointments, furnishing of records and reports, and availability of the report.[27][30]

The purpose of this restriction is to ensure that neither party has an opportunity to communicate ex parte (outside the presence of the other party) with the evaluator regarding substantive medical or factual issues that

might improperly influence the evaluator's opinions. A violation of this requirement can result in serious consequences. If a party communicates with the evaluator in violation of section 4062.3, Labor Code section 4062.3(f) and (g) and regulation section 35(k) provide that the aggrieved party may elect to terminate the medical evaluation and seek a new QME panel or may elect to proceed with the original evaluator accepting it as flawed.[27][30] The party that conducted the ex parte communication may be responsible for paying for the medical evaluation even if it is ultimately inadmissible.[27][30]

To avoid violations, any advocacy letter or communication conveying information (beyond simple scheduling matters) must identify what information is being conveyed, ensure that it has been previously agreed to by the parties or served on the opposing party with adequate time for response, and comply with the 20-day pre-evaluation service requirement for pre-evaluation communications and the simultaneous-service requirement for post-evaluation communications.[27][30] Courts have established that advocacy letters discussing legal positions or decisions do not necessarily constitute prohibited "information" if they do not contain, reference, or enclose medical records or other information covered by the prohibition, but advocacy letters that reference or misrepresent medical records, engage in sophistry regarding factual or medical issues, or misrepresent information provided to the evaluator can be objected to by the opposing party as crossing the line from permissible advocacy into prohibited information sharing.[27][30][41]

Evidentiary Standards and Admissibility of QME Reports

"Substantial Evidence" Standard and Legal Requirements

For a QME report to be admissible as evidence in workers' compensation proceedings and carry legal weight, it must constitute "substantial evidence."[33][24][41][65] Substantial evidence is evidence which, in light of all the evidence in the case, has enough probative force to warrant reliance on it in the determination of the disputed issue.[33][65] Stated differently, substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.[33][65] The burden of proving that a claim is compensable rests with the injured worker, but if a well-qualified and unbiased QME issues a favorable report addressing all disputed issues with adequate objective findings and medical reasoning, that report will typically satisfy the substantial evidence burden.[33][65]

Labor Code section 4628(e) provides critical consequences for non-compliance: failure to comply with the substantive content requirements renders the report inadmissible as evidence and eliminates any liability for payment of medical-legal expenses incurred in connection with the report.[24][44] This represents a powerful sanction-a non-compliant report is not merely subject to reduced weight but is wholly inadmissible, and the evaluator is not compensated for work that violates statutory requirements.[24][44]

However, California Code of Regulations section 10682(c) provides a parallel but distinct rule: all medical-legal reports shall comply with provisions of Labor Code section 4628, and except as otherwise provided by the Labor Code and WCAB rules, failure to comply with the requirements will not make the report inadmissible but will be considered in weighing the evidence.[24][24] This creates a distinction between violations serious enough to render a report entirely inadmissible under section 4628(e) and violations that affect only the weight given to the report.[24][41][24] Courts have interpreted this to mean that reports deficient in some way but containing adequate medical reasoning and addressing all major disputed issues may remain admissible but receive reduced weight, while reports that fundamentally fail to comply with section 4628 (such as by lacking a declaration under penalty of perjury, failing to identify records reviewed, or based on grossly inadequate examination) may be rendered inadmissible entirely.[24][41]

Objections to QME Reports and Grounds for Challenge

Parties frequently object to QME reports on the ground that they do not constitute substantial evidence or violate section 4628 requirements. Common grounds for objection include reports based on an inadequate medical history, reports based on an inadequate physical examination, reports utilizing an incorrect legal standard or theory, reports containing only conclusory opinions without supporting reasoning, and reports failing to address all disputed issues presented.[41][68] Additionally, reports from evaluators who are demonstrably biased or who hold predetermined positions regarding certain conditions or rating methodologies can be challenged on the basis of violating the neutrality requirements of section 41(c)(4).[21]

If a party believes a QME report does not constitute substantial evidence or violates section 4628, the party may file objections at the time of trial or hearing before the Workers' Compensation Judge. The judge must

then determine whether the report constitutes substantial evidence and whether deficiencies in the report can be cured through supplemental reporting or whether the deficiencies are so fundamental that they render the report inadmissible or warrant replacement of the QME.[41][50] The procedures established in the WCAB's decision in Sedalia v. Searcy address this analysis. When a WCJ determines that a report does not meet relevant minimum standards and the record offers no other competent medical-legal evidence, the judge must first consider whether deficiencies can be cured.[41][50] Only if deficiencies cannot be cured should the judge consider whether the report should be excluded or whether the QME should be replaced.[41][50]

Disability Evaluation Unit and Permanent Disability Rating Process

Summary Rating Process and DEU Procedures

After a QME report for an unrepresented injured worker finds permanent disability, the Disability Evaluation Unit (DEU) performs a summary rating, evaluating the QME's impairment findings and applying the applicable Permanent Disability Rating Schedule to determine a final permanent disability rating.[13][13][39][13] The DEU reviews the medical findings in the QME report and applies the factors specified in Labor Code section 4660: the employee's impairment (whole person impairment based on AMA Guides), adjustments for age and occupation, apportionment (if any), and multiplication by the appropriate adjustment factor (1.4 for injuries occurring January 1, 2013 or later; for prior injuries, various factors based on the 2005 or 1997 schedules).[12][13][34][13][13] The DEU may issue both a standard AMA Guides rating and an Almaraz/Guzman alternative rating when applicable, providing both perspectives for the trial judge.[13][13][13]

The DEU issues three types of ratings: summary ratings (for unrepresented workers with no application of adjudication filed), consultative ratings (for represented workers or workers who filed pro per applications), and formal ratings (based on instructions from a Workers' Compensation Judge after a hearing).[13][13][13] For unrepresented workers, after the initial summary rating, the parties may request reconsideration if they believe errors were made in the rating calculation or if the QME report itself contains factual errors that should be corrected.[12][13] A reconsideration request may be filed with the DEU with supporting documentation showing why the rating was calculated incorrectly or why the QME made factual errors.[12][13]

Apportionment Analysis and Causation-Based Reduction

A critical component of the DEU rating process is application of any apportionment determination made by the QME.[13][13][59] When the QME determines that a percentage of disability is attributable to pre-existing or non-industrial causes, that percentage is subtracted from the final disability rating.[59] Importantly, substantial medical evidence of apportionment must be both considered and applied by the DEU, and subsequent vocational evidence cannot override the apportionment without substantial basis.[59] This principle, established in cases such as Acme Foundry v. WCAB and Hennessey v. WCAB, ensures that once medical evidence of apportionment is established, it reduces the final disability award even if vocational evidence suggests the worker is completely unable to work.[59]

However, apportionment to "risk factors" is not permitted under Labor Code section 4663.[15][59] The distinction between a causative condition (which warrants apportionment) and a mere risk factor (which does not) is critical. A condition causes disability if it contributes to the development or exacerbation of the current impairment; a condition is a mere risk factor if it simply places the worker at increased statistical risk of injury or damage but does not directly cause the present disability.[15][59] For example, osteoporosis may be a risk factor for fractures in a worker with an industrial fall, but if the fracture would not have occurred (or would have been less severe) absent the osteoporosis, then osteoporosis is a causative condition warranting apportionment, not merely a risk factor.[15][59]

Strategic Considerations and Risk Analysis

Evaluating QME Reports: Strengths and Weaknesses

When analyzing a QME report, whether as the party who selected the evaluator, the party who did not, or as counsel representing a party, several factors determine whether the report constitutes solid evidence or contains vulnerabilities inviting supplemental reports or appellate challenge.[2][41] A strong QME report contains the following characteristics: addresses all contested medical issues without omission; includes

detailed objective findings from physical examination, diagnostic testing, and imaging studies; clearly identifies all medical records and information reviewed; provides medical reasoning explaining the basis for each conclusion rather than conclusory statements; addresses causation with specific reference to temporal relationships, mechanism of injury, and medical principles; properly applies AMA Guides methodology with specific reference to tables and chapters used; provides detailed apportionment analysis if apportionment is determined, with explanation of the medical basis for percentage attribution; identifies the legal standard applied (e.g., "reasonable medical probability" for causation); uses current and appropriate medical literature and guidelines; and demonstrates genuine neutrality and willingness to apply legal standards consistently rather than appearing biased toward one party.[2][2][41]

In contrast, a weak QME report exhibits the following characteristics: addresses only some of the contested issues while ignoring others; contains primarily subjective complaints from the injured worker without adequate objective findings; identifies records reviewed generically ("medical records provided") without listing specific documents; provides conclusions without explanatory reasoning ("Patient has 10% WPI" without explaining what AMA Guides table was used or how); fails to analyze causation adequately or relies on unsupported temporal inferences; misapplies AMA Guides methodology or uses outdated methodologies; provides minimal or no apportionment analysis despite facts suggesting pre-existing conditions contribute to disability; relies on incorrect legal standards (e.g., demanding statistical certainty rather than reasonable medical probability); demonstrates potential bias or predetermined positions (e.g., consistent treatment of similar cases in ways unexplained by facts); and contains internal inconsistencies (e.g., normal examination findings but opinion of substantial disability).[2][2][41][68]

Strategic Decisions: Challenging or Accepting QME Reports

When a party receives an unfavorable QME report, the party must decide whether to accept it, request supplemental reporting to clarify or develop specific issues, challenge it through cross-examination and contradictory evidence at trial, or seek replacement of the QME based on bias or fundamental deficiency.[50] This decision requires assessment of several factors: the strength and defensibility of the specific opinions with which the party disagrees; whether additional medical evidence supports a contrary position; the likelihood that supplemental reporting will improve the situation versus simply delaying resolution; whether the report contains deficiencies (inadequate examination, insufficient medical reasoning, failure to address disputed issues) that warrant formal objection; and the costs, timing, and disruption associated with each avenue.[2][41]

Requesting supplemental reporting may be appropriate when the report is otherwise adequate but fails to address a specific newly-discovered medical condition, when new diagnostic imaging or test results become available that should be reviewed, when a party wants the evaluator to respond to specific criticism about the methodology or reasoning (to develop the record), or when the original evaluation itself was somehow compromised (e.g., injured worker was in severe pain or unable to communicate adequately during examination).[10][32][10] However, supplemental reporting extends the timeline, costs additional fees to the evaluator, and may not result in the party's preferred outcome. Requesting supplemental reporting strategically, with specific identified deficiencies or issues to be addressed, is more likely to result in improved analysis than vague requests for reconsideration.[2][2][41]

Challenging a QME report at trial through cross-examination and contradictory evidence is appropriate when the report contains arguable deficiencies but is not fundamentally inadmissible, when the party has substantial medical evidence contradicting the QME's opinions, or when the weakness of the report can be exposed through skilled examination and rebuttal evidence.[41] This avenue preserves the report in the record but attacks its credibility and weight. It is appropriate when the party believes an alternative medical opinion is more persuasive than the QME's opinion and the trial judge should hear both perspectives and weigh them.

Seeking replacement of the QME based on bias or fundamental deficiency is an aggressive step appropriate only when the report reflects demonstrable bias (evaluator holds predetermined positions inconsistent with applying legal standards consistently), when the examination was so inadequate that substantial evidence cannot be based on it, or when the report so fundamentally violates section 4628 requirements that it is inadmissible.[21][41][50] This avenue should be pursued only when there is strong factual and legal basis for the challenge, as judges are reluctant to disqualify evaluators absent clear evidence of bias or fundamental defect.[21][41]

Settlement Leverage and Valuation Implications

A strong and well-reasoned QME report providing findings favorable to the injured worker significantly enhances settlement value and provides substantial negotiating leverage. Conversely, an unfavorable or weak QME report substantially reduces settlement value and weakens the worker's negotiating position. Insurance carriers rely heavily on QME opinions in determining their settlement reserves and offers, and evaluators' opinions on permanent disability ratings, causation, and future medical needs directly translate into dollar valuations.[1][3][1] Practitioners and parties must understand that a single QME report often determines whether a case settles quickly at reasonable value or proceeds to protracted litigation with uncertain outcomes.

For injured workers, a favorable QME finding of industrial causation of a claimed condition can mean the difference between acceptance and rejection of a claim worth potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical care and permanent disability benefits. For employers and insurers, an unfavorable QME finding of industrial causation or apportionment to non-industrial factors significantly reduces their financial exposure. The permanent disability rating component of a QME report translates directly into compensation amount through the applicable schedule.[31][34]

Service, Filing, and Procedural Compliance in Practice

Proper Service of QME Reports and Compliance with Statutory Forms

Compliance with service requirements is mandatory and can have consequences if violated.[5][30][5] For represented cases, the QME must complete and attach the QME Form 122 (AME or QME Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report), which requires the QME to certify that the report was served on each party listed, identify the method of service for each party (mail, overnight delivery, hand delivery, etc.), and certify the date on which service was completed.[11][5] The report must be served within 30 days of the examination.[10][32]

For unrepresented cases addressing permanent disability/apportionment, the QME must serve multiple documents beyond the report itself: the completed QME Form 111 (Findings Summary Form), a DWC-AD Form 100 (Employee's Disability Questionnaire), a DWC-AD Form 101 (Request for Summary Rating Determination), and appropriate separator sheets (DWC-CA Form 10232.2).[5][5][30] All documents must be served with appropriate separator sheets to the DEU office having jurisdiction over the employee's area of residence, as well as to the injured worker and claims administrator.[5][5][30] Failure to serve the DEU documents may result in delays in obtaining permanent disability ratings and may be grounds for requiring the QME to reissue the documents or obtain supplemental rating from the DEU.[5][5][30]

An important recent development regarding QME reappointment eligibility involves compliance with Form submission and service requirements.[4][47] QMEs are required to submit their two most recent medical-legal reports through an online portal maintained by the DWC Medical Unit as part of the reappointment process.[4][47] Reports must demonstrate compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements including timely submission, proper service on all parties, appropriate use of required forms, and substantive compliance with Labor Code section 4628 and section 35.5 requirements.[4][47] Failure to maintain compliance with these requirements can result in denial of reappointment or disciplinary action.[4][47]

Extension Requests and Time Management

QME practitioners must understand the extension process and time management requirements. The extension request form (QME Form 112) must be submitted to the Medical Director, injured worker, and claims administrator at least 5 days before the initial 30-day deadline expires.[10][32] If a QME submits the extension request fewer than 5 days before the deadline or after the deadline, the request will likely be rejected as untimely, and the QME will face either accepting a late report status or requesting replacement panel status.[10][32] QMEs applying for reappointment have been warned that repeated extension requests or requests approved excessive number of times can result in Medical Director scrutiny and potential discipline, as the Division emphasizes that evaluators should plan their workload to complete evaluations within the standard 30-day timeframe.[9][2][47]

The grounds for extension have been narrowed by DWC enforcement activity.[9][2] Medical emergencies, bereavement, and natural disasters clearly qualify as "good cause" and warrant extensions up to 15 days.[10][32] Waiting for test results or consultant reports may warrant extensions up to 30 days if the

evaluator did not have those results/reports at the time of examination and genuinely needs them to complete the evaluation.[10][32] However, requests based on general "busy schedule," vacation, or other scheduling conflicts are frequently denied.[9][2] QMEs are expected to calendar their appointment schedules and workload to ensure timely completion of reports within the standard 30-day window.[9][2]

Conclusion: Integration of QME Reports into Comprehensive Workers' Compensation Strategy

QME reports play a central role in determining the outcome of California workers' compensation claims and must be approached strategically by all parties. For injured workers, understanding the QME process, preparing adequately for evaluation, ensuring comprehensive presentation of evidence of causation and disability, and recognizing vulnerabilities in unfavorable reports are essential to protecting claim value. For employers and insurers, strategically requesting QME evaluations when favorable evidence exists, carefully preparing the case file and medical records to be reviewed, thoroughly examining QME opinions for deficiency, and where appropriate, challenging inadequate reports are critical to controlling claims costs and liability exposure.

The legal framework governing QME reports has matured substantially, with detailed statutory and regulatory requirements ensuring procedural uniformity while appellate decisions have clarified substantive standards for adequate medical reasoning, application of legal standards (reasonable medical probability rather than scientific certainty), and the boundaries between permissible alternative rating methodologies (Almaraz/Guzman) and improper advocacy bias. Recent regulatory changes increasing continuing education requirements and emphasizing timely report completion reflect the Division's commitment to quality and consistency in medical-legal evaluations.

The central challenge in the QME process is ensuring that evaluations are truly neutral, that medical reasoning is thorough and complete, and that all disputed issues are adequately addressed within the applicable legal and medical frameworks. When these standards are met, QME reports provide reliable evidence supporting just resolution of workers' compensation disputes. When these standards are not met, supplemental reporting delays claims resolution, increases costs, and undermines the efficiency of the system that workers' compensation law is designed to achieve.

References

[1] What Is A QME In California Workers' Compensation? (https://www.pi.law/blog/what-is-a-qme-in-california-workers-compensation-and-how-it-can-make-or-break-your-case/), Plaintiff's Injury Law, https://www.pi.law/blog/what-is-a-qme-in-california-workers-compensation-and-how-it-can-make-or-break-your-case/

[2] QME Report Requirements in California - Sound Medical Evaluators (https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-report-requirements-california/), Sound Medical Evaluators, https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-report-requirements-california/

[3] Qualified Medical Evaluator's Findings Summary Form (Unrepresented Cases Only) - QME Form 111 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm111.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm111.pdf

[4] DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html

[5] Title 8 Section36 - Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html

[6] Title 8 Section30 - QME Panel Requests (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html

[7] Labor Code Section4062.2 - Panel QME Process - Represented Workers (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-2-panel-qme-process-represented-workers/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-2-panel-qme-process-represented-workers/

[8] Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, Section 35.5 - Compliance by AMEs and QMEs with Administrative Director Evaluation and Reporting Guidelines (https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/8-CCR-35.5), Cornell Law School, https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/8-CCR-35.5

[9] QME Report Filing Under DWC Scrutiny (https://kb.daisybill.com/articles/qme-report-filing-under-dwc-scrutiny), daisyBill, https://kb.daisybill.com/articles/qme-report-filing-under-dwc-scrutiny

[6] Title 8 Section30 - QME Panel Requests (Online QME Form 106) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html

[4] DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html

[10] Title 8 Section38 - Medical Evaluation Time Frames; Extensions for QMEs and AMEs (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html

[11] AME or QME Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report (QME Form 122) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm122.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm122.pdf

[12] A Guidebook for Injured Workers - Chapter 7: Permanent Disability Benefits (https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf

[13] DWC FAQs on the PDRS for Practitioners (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html

[14] Title 8 Section122 - AME or QME Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/123.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/123.html

[15] How to Analyze Apportionment - by Judge Eric Ledger (https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/), California Lawyers Association, https://calawyers.org/workers-compensation/how-to-analyze-apportionment-by-judge-eric-ledger/

[16] AMA Guides | Evaluation of Permanent Impairment Overview (https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview), American Medical Association, https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/ama-guides/ama-guides-evaluation-permanent-impairment-overview

[17] Permanent & Stationary (P&S) V. Maximum Medical Improvement (MMI) (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-and-stationary-ps-vs-maximum-medical-improvement-mmi/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-and-stationary-ps-vs-maximum-medical-improvement-mmi/

[1] What Is A QME In California Workers' Compensation? (https://www.pi.law/blog/what-is-a-qme-in-california-workers-compensation-and-how-it-can-make-or-break-your-case/), Plaintiff's Injury Law, https://www.pi.law/blog/what-is-a-qme-in-california-workers-compensation-and-how-it-can-make-or-break-your-case/

[18] When I Return to Work (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/ReturnToWork.htm), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/ReturnToWork.htm

[12] A Guidebook for Injured Workers - Chapter 7: Permanent Disability Benefits (https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/injuredworkerguidebook/chapter7.pdf

[19] Labor Code Section4062.1: Panel QME Process - Unrepresented Workers (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-1-panel-qme-process-unrepresented-

workers/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-1-panel-qme-process-unrepresented-workers/

[20] Physician's Return-to-Work & Voucher Report (DWC AD Form 10133.36) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/SJDB/10133.36.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/SJDB/10133.36.pdf

[21] Removing a QME for Bias (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/), Bradford & Barthel LLP, https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/

[2] QME Report Requirements in California - Sound Medical Evaluators (https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-report-requirements-california/), Sound Medical Evaluators, https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-report-requirements-california/

[22] Labor Code Section4062 - Objections to Medical Determinations (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/

[23] Title 8 Section41 - Ethical Requirements for QMEs (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/41.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/41.html

[24] Title 8 Section10682 - Physicians' Reports as Evidence (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html

[5] Title 8 Section36 - Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html

[25] Unrepresented vs. Represented in the Panel QME Process (https://sbcdsa.org/2018/10/29/unrepresented-vs-represented-in-the-panel-qme-process/), Santa Barbara County Defense Counsel, https://sbcdsa.org/2018/10/29/unrepresented-vs-represented-in-the-panel-qme-process/

[26] DWC Online QME Form 106 Panel Request (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/OnlineQMEForm106PanelRequest.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/OnlineQMEForm106PanelRequest.html

[27] Title 8 Section35 - Exchange of Information and Ex Parte Communications (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html

[28] DWC Frequently Asked Questions about QME Form 106 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/FAQs.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/OnlineQMEForm106/FAQs.html

[29] QME Form 105 - Request for Qualified Medical Evaluator Panel (Unrepresented Employee) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/qmeforms/qmeform105.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms/qmeforms/qmeform105.pdf

[30] A Checklist for Communications with the QME (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/10/06/a-checklist-for-communications-with-the-qme/), Bradford & Barthel LLP, https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/10/06/a-checklist-for-communications-with-the-qme/

[31] Permanent Disability Rating Schedule (PDRS) - Workers' Comp (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/permanent-disability-rating-schedule-pdrs-workers-comp/

[32] Proving Causation for Delayed-Onset Workplace Injuries (https://mattwhiteattorney.com/proving-causation-delayed-workplace-injuries/), Matt White Attorney, https://mattwhiteattorney.com/proving-causation-delayed-workplace-injuries/

[33] What Constitutes Substantial Medical Evidence in California (LC 4628) (https://bpkfirm.com/what-constitutes-substantial-medical-evidence-in-california-lc-4628/), BPK Firm, https://bpkfirm.com/what-constitutes-substantial-medical-evidence-in-california-lc-4628/

[34] Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities (PDRS) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/pdr.pdf

[35] 1904.5 - Determination of work-relatedness (http://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1904/1904.5), Occupational Safety and Health Administration, http://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/regulations/standardnumber/1904/1904.5

[24] Title 8 Section10682 - Physicians' Reports as Evidence (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html

[36] Maintaining Your QME Appointment (https://www.unitedmedicalevaluators.com/qme-insights/maintaining-your-qme-appointment), United Medical Evaluators, https://www.unitedmedicalevaluators.com/qme-insights/maintaining-your-qme-appointment

[13] DWC FAQs on the PDRS for Practitioners (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html

[37] ALMARAZ/GUZMAN RATINGS - Fundamentals of the Case (https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf), https://irstore.blob.core.windows.net/materials/2c30b3ec-2e6c-423c-8905-7d9bbb08c6cd.pdf

[38] Title 8 Section34 - Appointment Notification and Cancellation (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/34.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/34.html

[39] DWC Disability Evaluation Unit (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html

[40] Another Almaraz/Guzman II Perspective (https://www.workcompcentral.com/news/article/id/f26dadead886df46f9afa8c6ce701188g), WorkCompCentral, https://www.workcompcentral.com/news/article/id/f26dadead886df46f9afa8c6ce701188g

[41] Steps to Prevent and Combat a Poorly Written Medical-Legal Report (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/steps-to-prevent-and-combat-a-poorly-written-medical-legal-report/), LFLM LLP, https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/steps-to-prevent-and-combat-a-poorly-written-medical-legal-report/

[42] Title 8 Section49.8 - Psychiatric Evaluation (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/49_8.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/49_8.html

[43] The Utilization Review Process: How to Get Proper Treatment from a Workers' Comp Doctor (https://www.scworkerscomp.com/blog/understanding-the-utilization-review-process-how-to-get-proper-treatment-from-a-workers-comp-doctor), SoCal Workers Comp, https://www.scworkerscomp.com/blog/understanding-the-utilization-review-process-how-to-get-proper-treatment-from-a-workers-comp-doctor

[44] California Labor Code 4628 - Comprehensive Medical-Legal Reports (https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf), California Organization of Attorneys, https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf

[45] Labor Code Section4060 - Medical Evaluations For Denied Claims (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74060-medical-evaluations-fo-denied-claims/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74060-medical-evaluations-fo-denied-claims/

[46] Deferring Utilization Review: What You Need to Know (https://ieatraining.org/ai-influencing-workers-compensation-claims-16), IEA Training, https://ieatraining.org/ai-influencing-workers-compensation-claims-16

[13] DWC FAQs on the PDRS for Practitioners (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/faq/deu_faq.html

[47] DWC FAQs on QMEs for Physicians (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/faqphys.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/faqphys.html

[48] WCAB En Banc Holds Replacement Panel Not Automatic for Failure to Timely Schedule an Evaluation (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/special-report-wcab-en-banc-holds-replacement-panel-not-automatic-for-failure-to-timely-schedule-an-evaluation), Sullivan on Comp, https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/special-report-wcab-en-banc-holds-replacement-panel-not-automatic-for-failure-to-timely-schedule-an-evaluation

[39] DWC Disability Evaluation Unit (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/deu.html

[49] DWC Payment Options (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/Payments/Payments.htm), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/Payments/Payments.htm

[50] Sedalia v. Searcy - Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Decision (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Sedalia-SEARCY-ADJ14483830.pdf), Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Sedalia-SEARCY-ADJ14483830.pdf

[51] Request for a Replacement Panel Pursuant to Romero (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/request-replacement-panel-pursuant-romero), Sullivan Attorneys, https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/request-replacement-panel-pursuant-romero

[52] California Workers' Comp: Claims for Psychiatric Injuries (https://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/california-workers-comp-recovering-mental-emotional-injuries.html), Nolo, https://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/california-workers-comp-recovering-mental-emotional-injuries.html

[53] QME Selection If a Party Fails to Timely Strike (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/qme-selection-if-a-party-fails-to-timely-strike), Sullivan on Comp, https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/qme-selection-if-a-party-fails-to-timely-strike

[6] Title 8 Section30 - QME Panel Requests (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html

[54] Title 8 Section36.5 - Service of Comprehensive Medical/Legal Report in Claims of Injury to the Psyche (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36_5.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36_5.html

[55] CA Labor Code Section 4062.2 - Represented Employee QME Selection (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2), Justia, https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4062.2

[24] Title 8 Section10682 - Physicians' Reports as Evidence (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10682.html

[56] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits After a Work Injury in California (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/vocational-rehabilitation-benefits-after-a-work-injury-in-california/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/vocational-rehabilitation-benefits-after-a-work-injury-in-california/

[57] Change of Treating Physician After Discharge from Care (https://ieatraining.org/change-of-treating-physician-after-discharge-from-care/), IEA Training, https://ieatraining.org/change-of-treating-physician-after-discharge-from-care/

[58] California Labor Code Section 5502.5 - Continuance of Conference or Hearing (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-3/section-5502-5/), Justia, https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-3/section-5502-5/

[59] California: A Critical Assessment of "Vocational Apportionment" (https://www.pbw-law.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Article_on_Vocational_Apportionment.pdf), https://www.pbw-law.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Article_on_Vocational_Apportionment.pdf

[60] Title 8 Section9786 - Petition for Change of Primary Treating Physician (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/9786.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/9786.html

[61] How Do I Settle My Workers' Comp Case? C&R vs. Stipulated Award (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/how-do-i-settle-my-workers-comp-case-cr-vs-stipulated-award/), Employees First Labor Law, https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/how-do-i-settle-my-workers-comp-case-cr-vs-stipulated-award/

[62] Preparing for Cross-Examination: QME Report Defense Tips (https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-cross-examination-report-defense/), Sound Medical Evaluators, https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/qme-cross-examination-report-defense/

[5] Title 8 Section36 - Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html

[63] How Is My Case Resolved (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/CaseResolved.htm), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/CaseResolved.htm

[64] Use of the Fifth Amendment in Workers' Compensation (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/sure-log-fifth-amendment), Sullivan on Comp, https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/sure-log-fifth-amendment

[10] Title 8 Section38 - Medical Evaluation Time Frames; Extensions for QMEs and AMEs (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html

[65] Understanding Substantial Evidence in Workers' Comp Cases (https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/), Work Injury Law Center, https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/

[66] Request for Factual Correction of an Unrepresented Panel QME Report (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm37.pdf), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/FORMS/QMEForms/QMEForm37.pdf

[67] DWC Posts Adjustments to Official Medical Fee Schedule for Physician and Non-Physician Practitioner Services (https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-16.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-16.html

[68] WCAB Emphasizes Proper Standards in Workers' Compensation Cases (https://www.rjylaw.com/when-medical-opinions-fall-short-wcab-emphasizes-proper-standards-in-workers-compensation-cases/), Yrulegui & Roberts, https://www.rjylaw.com/when-medical-opinions-fall-short-wcab-emphasizes-proper-standards-in-workers-compensation-cases/

[69] Title 8 Section37 - Request for Factual Correction of a Comprehensive Medical-Legal Report from a Panel QME (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/37.html), State of California Code of Regulations, https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/37.html

[70] New QME Process Regulation Section 55.1 in Effect on April 1, 2026 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-11.html), State of California Division of Workers' Compensation, https://www.dir.ca.gov/DIRNews/2026/2026-11.html