Objecting to Qualified Medical Evaluator and Agreed Medical Evaluator Reports as Not Constituting Substantial Medical Evidence in California Workers' Compensation Cases: A Legal Analysis

(PART-A INJURED WORKERS ANALYSIS)

March 2, 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.

OBJECTING TO QME AND AME REPORTS AS NOT SUBSTANTIAL MEDICAL EVIDENCE IN CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION

This report explains when and how you can challenge a medical report from a Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) or Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME) if you believe the report does not meet the legal standard of substantial medical evidence in your California workers' compensation case. A QME is a doctor certified by the state to conduct independent medical evaluations in workers' compensation disputes. An AME is a doctor that both you and the insurance company agree to use. If the QME or AME report is flawed, you have the right to challenge it.

Part 1: What Is "Substantial Medical Evidence"?

This section explains the legal standard that every medical report must meet before a judge can rely on it to decide your case.

The Basic Standard

Substantial medical evidence means evidence good enough in quality and quantity that a reasonable person would accept it as adequate to support a factual conclusion. This standard comes from 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 10605 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/10605.html) and applies to every medical report used in workers' compensation proceedings.

You do not need to prove your case with absolute certainty or perfect scientific proof. A single qualified doctor's opinion can be enough — but only if that opinion meets specific quality requirements.

The Escobedo Requirements

The most important case setting these requirements is Escobedo v. Marshalls, 70 Cal.Comp.Cases 604 (WCAB En Banc 2005) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/2005-EB-4.pdf). Under Escobedo, a medical report qualifies as substantial evidence only when it meets all of the following conditions:

- The opinion is based on reasonable medical probability — meaning it is "more likely than not" — not on speculation, guesswork, or assumption.
- The opinion rests on an adequate examination and history of the injured worker.
- The opinion addresses pertinent facts — the facts that actually matter in your case.
- The opinion does not rely on facts that are outdated or no longer relevant.
- The opinion explains the medical and factual reasoning behind its conclusions, not just the conclusions themselves.

This last point — the requirement to explain reasoning — has become the most important factor in recent cases. Judges are increasingly rejecting reports that simply state conclusions without explaining the "how and why."

The Reasoning Requirement Under Gatten

The Court of Appeal strengthened this standard in E.L. Yeager Construction v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Gatten), 145 Cal.App.4th 922 (2006) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Stephen-CHAPLIN-ADJ10576891-ADJ7024529.pdf). The court held that a medical report that lacks reasoning to support its conclusions does not constitute substantial evidence. This means a doctor cannot simply write "the injury is not work-related" or assign a disability percentage without explaining exactly why.

> ***Important: A report that only states conclusions without explaining the medical reasoning behind them can be rejected by the judge, no matter how qualified the doctor is.***

Part 2: Key Laws Governing Medical Reports

This section covers the statutes that control how QME and AME reports must be prepared and what they must contain.

Labor Code Section 4628: Report Preparation Rules

Cal. Lab. Code § 4628 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-2/chapter-2/article-2-5/section-4628/) sets strict rules for how medical-legal reports are prepared. These rules operate on a strict liability basis, meaning violations automatically make the report inadmissible (cannot be used as evidence) — there are no excuses.

Key requirements include:

- Only the doctor who signs the report may examine you. No one other than a nurse performing routine tasks like taking blood pressure may participate.
- No one other than the signing doctor may take your complete medical history, review and summarize your prior medical records, or write the conclusions of the report.
- The report must disclose the date and location of the evaluation, confirm the signing doctor performed it, and identify anyone who helped with non-clerical tasks.
- The report must contain a declaration under penalty of perjury — a sworn statement that the information is true and correct.

The penalty for violations: Under Section 4628(e), if the doctor fails to comply with these requirements, the report becomes inadmissible as evidence and the doctor cannot be paid for it. The Court of Appeal confirmed this strict approach in Scheffield Medical Group, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 70 Cal.App.4th 868 (1999) (https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/4th/70/868.html).

Labor Code Section 4062.3: Rules About Communicating with Doctors

Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.3 (https://www.rjylaw.com/labor-code-section-4062-3-information-vs-communication/) controls what information parties can send to QMEs and AMEs. Ex parte communication means one side communicating privately with the doctor without telling the other side.

Key rules:

- Any substantive documents or information you want to send to the evaluator must be served on the opposing party 20 days before sending them to the doctor.
- Non-substantive matters like scheduling appointments or asking about report availability can be communicated at any time, as long as you send a copy to the other side at the same time.
- If either side violates these communication rules, the other side may request a new QME panel from the Medical Director (the state official overseeing QME administration), or may choose to continue with the same evaluator.

Labor Code Section 4663: Apportionment Requirements

Apportionment means dividing your permanent disability between work-related causes and non-work causes (like aging or pre-existing conditions). Cal. Lab. Code § 4663 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/) requires doctors to:

- Identify what approximate percentage of your permanent disability was caused by your work injury.
- Identify what approximate percentage was caused by other factors (prior injuries, pre-existing conditions, natural aging).
- Explain the medical reasoning — the "how and why" — behind those percentages.

A report that does not include an apportionment determination is considered incomplete and can be returned to the doctor for correction.

Part 3: Statutes That Trigger Medical Evaluations

This section explains the different types of medical disputes that lead to QME or AME evaluations.

Three Categories of Disputes

Different sections of the Labor Code cover different types of medical disagreements:

- Cal. Lab. Code § 4060 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/) covers disputes about whether your injury happened at work (compensability). You bear the burden of proving work-relatedness, meaning the QME's opinion on causation must affirmatively support your claim.
- Cal. Lab. Code § 4061 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4061) covers disputes about how much permanent disability you have, what your work limitations are, and whether you need continuing medical care.
- Cal. Lab. Code § 4062 (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/) covers all other medical disputes, including whether you need specific treatment or whether you have reached maximum medical improvement (MMI) — the point where your condition is not expected to get better with further treatment.

Regulatory Requirements for the QME Process

Several state regulations control QME procedures:

- 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 30 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html) governs how QME panel requests are submitted and requires that the panel list and supporting documents be served on the other party within one working day.
- 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 35 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html) establishes rules for exchanging information and prohibiting ex parte communications, including the 20-day advance service requirement for substantive information.
- 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 38 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html) requires QMEs and AMEs to complete evaluations and issue reports within 30 days, with possible extensions of up to 30 additional days with Medical Director approval.

> ***Important: Failure to follow panel service requirements can invalidate the entire panel. In Lopez v. Rockstar Staffing, Inc. (2023), the WCAB rescinded a panel because supporting documentation was not served on time.***

Part 4: Recent Legal Developments You Should Know

This section covers major recent decisions that change how QME reports are challenged and how replacement panels work.

The Vazquez Decision: Replacement Is No Longer Automatic

The most significant recent development is the WCAB's en banc decision in Vazquez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (WCAB En Banc 2025) (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/wcab-en-banc-replacement-panel-not-automatic-late-evaluation). Before this decision, many people believed they had an automatic right to a replacement QME if the doctor was late with scheduling or reporting. Vazquez changed that.

Under Vazquez, judges must now consider five factors before ordering replacement:

- How long the delay lasted.
- Whether the delay or the replacement would cause more harm.
- What efforts were made to fix the scheduling or reporting problem.
- Case-specific reasons that justify keeping or replacing the QME.
- Whether the requesting party waited too long to object, effectively giving up the right to complain (waiver).

This decision means judges now prefer to keep the current QME and fix problems through supplemental reports rather than starting over with a new doctor.

Recent Decisions on Report Quality

Several 2025 WCAB panel decisions have tightened standards for what makes a report "substantial":

- In Jesus Garcia v. (ADJ20170253) (2025), the WCAB found a QME's causation opinion lacked substantiality because the doctor failed to adequately investigate the worker's actual job duties despite a three-month employment period.
- In Mario Manriquez Jr. (ADJ2574910) (2025), the WCAB ordered replacement of a QME whose reports contained internal contradictions and failed to address the agreed-upon description of the injury.

- In Nunes v. State of California, Dept. of Motor Vehicles, 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741 (WCAB En Banc 2023) (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/wcab-rejects-concept-of-vocational-apportionment-in-rare-en-banc-decision/), the WCAB rejected "vocational apportionment" and held that all disability experts must use medical reasoning, not just wage-loss analysis.

Strict Enforcement of Section 4628

Recent decisions confirm that Section 4628 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-2/chapter-2/article-2-5/section-4628/) violations are treated as strict liability. In Venegas v. (ADJ18498378) (2025), the WCAB stated that if a doctor fails to comply with statutory requirements, the report is inadmissible — there are no exceptions under the plain language of the statute.

> ***Note: Not every violation makes a report inadmissible. Violations of Section 4628(e) (doctor participation requirements) trigger automatic inadmissibility. Violations of regulatory requirements may only reduce the report's weight rather than exclude it entirely.***

Upcoming Changes: AB 1293

Assembly Bill 1293, which passed the California Assembly unanimously in June 2025, will require the Division of Workers' Compensation to create a template QME report form that includes all requirements for a complete report constituting substantial evidence. Implementation is expected by January 1, 2027 (https://blog.daisybill.com/ca-med-legal-bill-2025). Once in effect, reports following the template may be presumed adequate, potentially shifting the burden to the party challenging the report.

Part 5: How to Object to a Deficient Report

This section provides four strategies you can use to challenge a QME or AME report that does not meet the substantial evidence standard.

Strategy 1: Request a Supplemental Report

When a report has specific gaps — missing analysis of certain body parts, failure to review key records, or conclusory apportionment — the first step is to ask the same doctor to issue a supplemental report that fixes the problems.

Under Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.3(i) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html), you can request a supplemental report when relevant medical records are received. To make this request:

1. Identify the specific issues in the original report that need more analysis.
2. List what medical records or evidence the doctor did not review.
3. Provide copies of any missing records.
4. Request specific findings addressing each identified gap.
5. Comply with the 20-day notice requirement if you are including new substantive information.

The doctor has 60 days to complete the supplemental report. The WCAB has stated that supplemental reporting is the preferred procedure for fixing report problems, as established in McDuffie v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority, 67 Cal.Comp.Cases 138 (WCAB 2003).

Strategy 2: Depose the QME or AME

A deposition is a formal question-and-answer session under oath, taken outside of court and recorded by a court reporter. You can depose the QME or AME to:

- Show that the doctor cannot explain the medical basis for conclusions in the report.
- Expose inconsistencies between the report and the doctor's testimony.
- Establish that the doctor did not perform certain examinations or tests.
- Demonstrate bias or predetermined conclusions.

In Byers v. Sonsray Machinery, the WCAB recognized that deposition testimony can either strengthen or weaken a report's substantiality — depending on what the doctor says under questioning.

Strategy 3: File a Motion to Strike the Report

When a report violates Section 4628 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-2/chapter-2/article-2-5/section-4628/) or has deficiencies too serious to fix, you can ask the judge to strike the report — meaning it cannot be used as evidence at all. Grounds for striking include:

- Non-physician participation in the examination or report preparation.
- Failure to sign the declaration under penalty of perjury.
- Complete absence of factual basis for conclusions.
- Application of the wrong legal standard.
- Demonstrable bias in the report.

> ***Critical: Striking a report is an extraordinary remedy. In Oscar Villalobos v. (ADJ2913113) (2025), the WCAB reversed a judge's decision to strike an AME report, stating that even deficient reports may stay in evidence while the judge assigns them minimal weight.***

Strategy 4: Challenge the Report at Trial

If earlier strategies do not resolve the problem, you can challenge the report's substantiality at trial by presenting:

- Treating physician reports offering different opinions.
- Other medical-legal evidence contradicting the QME or AME.
- Your own testimony about facts the report mischaracterized.
- Expert testimony criticizing the doctor's methodology.

As the California Supreme Court established in Jones v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd., 68 Cal.2d 476 (1968) (https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/34/159.html), judges have the authority to choose among conflicting medical reports and rely on the one they find most persuasive. However, judges must explain why they rejected a QME opinion, as required by Cal. Lab. Code § 5313 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-7/article-2/section-5952/).

Part 6: What Makes a Report Deficient

This section explains the specific problems that can make a QME or AME report fail the substantial evidence standard.

Problem 1: Failure to Obtain Adequate History

The doctor must take a thorough medical and occupational history. If the doctor evaluated you without asking detailed questions about your job duties, how your injury happened, how often you performed certain tasks, or your medical history before the injury, the report rests on an inadequate foundation.

In Jesus Garcia v. (ADJ20170253) (2025), the WCAB found a causation opinion lacking because the QME took only a cursory history about the worker's job duties during a three-month employment period. The doctor did not investigate what specific tasks the worker performed, how frequently, or what physical demands each task involved.

Problem 2: Internal Contradictions

If a report contradicts itself — for example, denying that your injury is work-related while also finding that work aggravated a pre-existing condition — those contradictions undermine its reliability. In Mario Manriquez Jr. (ADJ2574910) (2025), the WCAB struck part of a QME report because the doctor acknowledged "cumulative injury" language in the case stipulations but then opined that no cumulative injury occurred.

Problem 3: Conclusory Apportionment

This is the most common reason reports are found deficient. A doctor cannot simply write "40% pre-existing degeneration" without explaining:

- What specific age-related or pre-existing changes are present.
- What functional impairment those changes cause.
- How those impairments were measured.
- Why the specific percentage reflects medical probability.

In Nunes v. State of California, 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741 (WCAB En Banc 2023) (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/wcab-rejects-concept-of-vocational-apportionment-in-rare-en-banc-decision/), the WCAB rejected apportionment that identified percentages for pre-existing degeneration without explaining which specific symptoms or functional losses were attributable to each cause.

In Evyette Gaines v. (ADJ15875626) (2025), the WCAB found apportionment conclusions "conclusory" because the doctor mentioned pre-existing factors but failed to explain how those factors currently contributed to permanent disability.

Problem 4: Failure to Review Key Records

A medical report is not substantial evidence unless it includes review of all relevant records, as established in Place v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd., 3 Cal.3d 372 (1970) (https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat14JudgeAllysonHall.pdf). If the doctor failed to review recent diagnostic imaging, treating physician notes, or other important medical records that were available before the evaluation, the report's foundation is inadequate.

Who Has the Burden of Proof?

The party claiming a report is deficient must prove the deficiency. This means you must present specific evidence — contrary medical reports, deposition testimony, or identification of concrete errors — rather than simply stating you disagree. However, judges also have a responsibility to ensure that the evidence they rely on meets the substantial evidence standard, as established in Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation, 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473 (WCAB En Banc 2001).

Part 7: Arguments For and Against Substantiality Challenges

This section outlines the main arguments each side uses when fighting over whether a report meets the standard.

Arguments That a Report Is Not Substantial

If you are the injured worker challenging a report, your strongest arguments include:

- Inadequate history: The doctor did not ask enough questions about your job duties, injury mechanism, or medical background. You must show what information was available but not obtained.
- Internal contradictions: The report contradicts itself on key points. Identify the specific conflicting passages and explain why the contradiction makes the opinion unreliable.
- Missing reasoning ("how and why"): The doctor stated conclusions without explaining the medical basis. This is the most frequently successful argument in recent cases, particularly for apportionment disputes under Gatten and Escobedo standards.
- Failure to address key evidence: The doctor ignored important medical records, diagnostic imaging, or treating physician findings that were available before the evaluation.

Arguments That a Report Is Substantial

If you are the insurance company or employer defending a report, your strongest arguments include:

- Single physician opinion is enough: Under Place v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd., 3 Cal.3d 372 (1970) (https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat14JudgeAllysonHall.pdf), a single qualified doctor's opinion constitutes substantial evidence unless it is shown to be erroneous, beyond the doctor's expertise, or based on an inadequate history.
- Deference to neutral evaluator: QMEs are state-certified, neutral doctors. Courts generally give significant weight to their opinions because of their impartiality.
- Challenger must present contrary evidence: Simply disagreeing with the QME is not enough. The challenging party must present substantial contrary medical evidence meeting the same quality standards.
- Substantiality vs. persuasiveness: A report can be substantial (legally adequate) even if it is not the most persuasive evidence available. Judges should assign appropriate weight rather than strike the report entirely. This principle was reinforced in Oscar Villalobos v. (ADJ2913113) (2025).

Part 8: Step-by-Step Timeline for Responding to an Adverse Report

This section provides a practical roadmap for what to do when you receive a QME or AME report that you believe is flawed.

Days 1–5: Review and Assess

Upon receiving the report:

1. Read the entire report carefully and identify every specific deficiency — missing analysis, unsupported conclusions, records not reviewed, internal contradictions.
2. Note the page numbers where each problem appears.
3. Determine whether the problems can be fixed with a supplemental report or whether replacement is necessary.
4. Check for procedural violations (ex parte communications, untimely report, non-physician participation).

Days 6–10: Communicate with the Other Side

Write a letter to the opposing attorney that:

1. Identifies specific deficiencies in the report with page references.
2. Proposes a remedy (supplemental report, deposition, or replacement).
3. Asks for the other side's position on your proposed remedy.
4. Sets a realistic timeline for resolution.

This letter creates a record of your good-faith effort to resolve the dispute, which judges look for in later proceedings.

Days 11–30: Choose Your Strategy

Make your first major decision based on:

- How severe the deficiencies are.
- Whether supplemental reporting can realistically fix them.
- How strong your other medical evidence is.
- How close you are to your Mandatory Settlement Conference (MSC) or trial date.
- Your goals (faster resolution vs. thorough record development).

If pursuing a supplemental report, send a detailed written request to the QME identifying specific issues and providing any missing records. Comply with the Section 4062.3 (https://www.rjylaw.com/labor-code-section-4062-3-information-vs-communication/) 20-day notice requirement.

If pursuing replacement, file a formal request with the Medical Director (for QMEs) or a motion with the judge (for AMEs).

Days 31–60: Develop the Record

- If you requested a supplemental report, monitor the 60-day completion deadline.
- If you are gathering new medical evidence, obtain treating physician reports or retain a qualified expert to address the deficiencies.
- If you requested replacement, track the Medical Director's response and prepare for new panel selection.

Days 61–90: Prepare for MSC or Trial

- Prepare written objections identifying all remaining deficiencies.
- Coordinate any scheduled depositions of the QME or AME.
- Organize your evidence, including side-by-side comparisons of the QME report with contradictory treating physician opinions.

> ***Important: Discovery generally closes on the MSC date under Cal. Lab. Code § 5502(d)(3) (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-7/article-2/section-5952/). All evidence must be filed and disclosed by that date.***

Part 9: Risk Assessment for Each Strategy

This section helps you understand the likelihood of success and potential downsides of each approach.

Supplemental Report: Low to Medium Risk

- Likelihood of success: About 20–30% of requests result in meaningful improvements that address all identified issues.
- Best outcome: The supplemental report fixes the gaps and supports your position. No delay from starting over with a new doctor.
- Worst outcome: The supplemental report reinforces the original conclusions, making the adverse opinion even stronger.
- Best for: Cases where the problem is informational (missing records, unaddressed body parts) rather than methodological (wrong approach or bias).

Replacement Panel: Medium to High Risk

- Likelihood of success: About 10–20% of contested requests are granted (higher if procedural violations are shown).
- Best outcome: New QME reaches different, more favorable conclusions.
- Worst outcome: Request is denied, causing delay without benefit. Or new QME reaches even worse conclusions.
- Key consideration: Since the Vazquez (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/wcab-en-banc-replacement-panel-not-automatic-late-evaluation) decision, judges are more reluctant to grant replacement absent clear prejudice.

Trial Challenge: Medium to High Risk

- Likelihood of success with strong contrary evidence: About 40–60%, depending on how detailed and well-reasoned your treating physician's reports are.
- Likelihood of success without contrary evidence: About 10–20%. A single neutral doctor's unrebutted opinion usually controls the outcome.
- Best outcome: Judge credits your treating physician's evidence over the QME report.
- Worst outcome: Judge finds the QME report substantial despite your challenge, and your case proceeds on the basis of that adverse evidence.

Key Timing Deadlines

- Object to untimely reports within 10 days of the deadline to preserve replacement rights.
- File supplemental report requests at least 60 days before your MSC.
- File replacement requests at least 60–90 days before key hearing dates to allow time for new panel selection.
- All evidence must be disclosed by the MSC date under Section 5502.

Part 10: Documents and Evidence You Need

This section describes what evidence you should gather to support your challenge.

Documentary Evidence

Compile the following:

- All versions of the QME or AME report (original and any supplements).
- All medical records that were available to the doctor, especially any the report does not mention.
- Job descriptions and occupational history information that was or should have been available.
- All written communications regarding the evaluation.
- Documentation of any procedural violations (late reports, ex parte contacts, non-physician participation).

Treating Physician Reports

Detailed reports from your treating doctors are the most powerful contrary evidence, especially when they:

- Address facts the QME or AME report ignored.

- Include more recent medical findings or test results.
- Reflect longer-term observation of your condition.
- Provide detailed medical reasoning for their opinions.

Deposition Transcripts

If you deposed the QME or AME, the transcript becomes evidence you can use at trial to show the doctor cannot support the report's conclusions.

Expert Critique

If you retain a medical expert to specifically critique the QME or AME report's methodology, that critique is admissible evidence. The critique should identify exact deficiencies and reference applicable medical standards — not just express general disagreement.

> ***Important: All medical records must be authenticated (verified as genuine) and served on the opposing party in compliance with discovery rules before they can be used at trial.***

Part 11: Decision-Making Framework

This section provides a summary framework to guide your decisions when facing an adverse QME or AME report.

Decision Point 1: Can the Problems Be Fixed?

If the deficiency involves missing analysis, unreviewed records, or incomplete discussion of specific issues, request a supplemental report first. This is the lowest-risk option and the approach judges prefer.

Decision Point 2: Are There Procedural Violations?

If there are ex parte communication violations, Section 4628 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-2/chapter-2/article-2-5/section-4628/) violations, or clear bias, pursue replacement early. Remember that success increasingly requires showing actual prejudice, not just technical violations.

Decision Point 3: How Strong Is Your Other Evidence?

If your treating physicians provided detailed, well-reasoned reports that contradict the QME, you may be able to win at trial on the weight of that contrary evidence without needing to prove the QME report is legally insubstantial.

Decision Point 4: What Are Your Time Constraints?

Supplemental reports take at least 60 days. Replacement panels take 60–90 days. Factor these timelines into your case management decisions based on your MSC and trial dates.

> ***Note: The trend in California workers' compensation law favors developing the existing record over replacing evaluators. Judges want to see that you made good-faith efforts to fix problems before asking for a new doctor.***

References

1. 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 10605 — Substantial Evidence Standard (https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/)
2. Escobedo v. Marshalls, 70 Cal.Comp.Cases 604 (WCAB En Banc 2005) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/2005-EB-4.pdf)
3. E.L. Yeager Construction v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Gatten), 145 Cal.App.4th 922 (2006) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Stephen-CHAPLIN-ADJ10576891-ADJ7024529.pdf)
4. Cal. Lab. Code § 4628 — Medical-Legal Report Requirements (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-2/chapter-2/article-2-5/section-4628/)
5. Scheffield Medical Group, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 70 Cal.App.4th 868 (1999) (https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/4th/70/868.html)

6. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062.3 — Communication Restrictions for Medical Evaluators (https://www.rjylaw.com/labor-code-section-4062-3-information-vs-communication/)

7. Cal. Lab. Code § 4663 — Apportionment of Permanent Disability (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/)

8. Cal. Lab. Code § 4060 — Disputes Regarding Compensability (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/)

9. Cal. Lab. Code § 4061 — Disputes Regarding Permanent Impairment (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4061)

10. Cal. Lab. Code § 4062 — Disputes Regarding Other Medical Determinations (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/)

11. 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 30 — QME Panel Requests (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html)

12. 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 35 — Exchange of Information and Ex Parte Communications (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html)

13. 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 38 — Medical Evaluation Time Frames (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html)

14. Vazquez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (WCAB En Banc 2025) — Replacement Panel Not Automatic (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/wcab-en-banc-replacement-panel-not-automatic-late-evaluation)

15. Nunes v. State of California, Dept. of Motor Vehicles, 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741 (WCAB En Banc 2023) — Vocational Apportionment Rejected (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/wcab-rejects-concept-of-vocational-apportionment-in-rare-en-banc-decision/)

16. Jones v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd., 68 Cal.2d 476 (1968) (https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/34/159.html)

17. Place v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd., 3 Cal.3d 372 (1970) — Single Physician Standard (https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat14JudgeAllysonHall.pdf)

18. Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 219 Cal.App.4th 1235 (2013) (https://www.pbw-law.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Apportionment-Case-Law-Update-January-2025-logo.pdf) [URL unavailable — case available through legal databases]

19. Cal. Lab. Code § 5502 — Mandatory Settlement Conference Discovery Closure (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-7/article-2/section-5952/)

20. AB 1293 — Pending Medical-Legal Reform Legislation (Implementation by January 1, 2027) (https://blog.daisybill.com/ca-med-legal-bill-2025)

21. AB 1293 — Bill Text (https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB1293/id/3207682)

22. Lopez v. Rockstar Staffing, Inc. (2023) — QME Panel Service Requirements (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/service-of-qualified-medical-evaluator-panels)

23. Steps to Prevent and Combat a Poorly Written Medical-Legal Report — Laughlin, Falbo, Levy & Moresi (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/steps-to-prevent-and-combat-a-poorly-written-medical-legal-report/)

24. Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation, 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473 (WCAB En Banc 2001) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_panel.htm) [URL unavailable — available through WCAB En Banc decision records]

25. Rosas v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd., 16 Cal.App.4th 1692 (1993) (https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat14JudgeAllysonHall.pdf) [URL unavailable — case available through legal databases]

26. DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process — California DIR (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html)

27. Venegas v. (ADJ18498378) (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Maria-VENEGAS-ADJ18498378.pdf)

28. Oscar Villalobos v. (ADJ2913113) (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Oscar-VILLALOBOS-ADJ2913113.pdf)

29. Jesus Garcia v. (ADJ20170253) (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Jesus-GARCIA-ADJ20170253%20ADJ12518949.pdf)

30. Mario Manriquez Jr. v. (ADJ2574910) (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Mario-MANRIQUEZ%20JR-ADJ2574910.pdf)

31. Evyette Gaines v. (ADJ15875626) (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Evyette-GAINES-ADJ15875626.pdf)

32. Ariel Prudente v. (ADJ13119496) (WCAB Panel Decision 2025) — Ex Parte Remedy Analysis (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/striking-a-qualified-medical-evaluator-and-the-mailbox-rule-revisited)

Objecting to Qualified Medical Evaluator and Agreed Medical Evaluator Reports as Not Constituting Substantial Medical Evidence in California Workers' Compensation Cases: A Legal Analysis

(PART-B LEGAL ANALYSIS)

Generated by: Legal AI Assistant

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

March 2, 2026

Objecting to Qualified Medical Evaluator and Agreed Medical Evaluator Reports as Not Constituting Substantial Medical Evidence in California Workers' Compensation Cases: A Comprehensive Legal Analysis

Executive Summary

The determination of whether a Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) or Agreed Medical Evaluator (AME) report constitutes "substantial medical evidence" stands as one of the most consequential issues in California workers' compensation litigation. This report addresses the framework for objecting to medical-legal reports on grounds of insufficient substantiality, the applicable legal standards governing such objections, current procedural mechanisms available to challenge deficient reports, and the strategic considerations parties must weigh when deciding whether to proceed with record development, supplemental reporting, replacement panels, or trial challenges. Substantial medical evidence represents evidence sufficient in quality and quantity that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a factual conclusion, and medical reports failing to meet this threshold can be assigned minimal evidentiary weight or struck entirely. Recent Board decisions demonstrate a judicial preference for record development through supplemental reports rather than automatic replacement of medical evaluators, though significant deficiencies in methodology, causation analysis, or apportionment reasoning continue to warrant QME removal in limited circumstances. The burden of proving that a report lacks substantiality rests with the party making such assertion, requiring presentation of contrary evidence of considerable substance or identification of specific statutory violations that render the report inadmissible under Labor Code section 4628(e). This report provides a complete roadmap for identifying deficient reports, timing objections appropriately, understanding the requirements for medical-legal evidence to constitute substantial proof, and implementing strategic responses at the trial and appellate levels.

Legal Framework and Statutory Authority

Definition and Foundational Principles of Substantial Medical Evidence

The term "substantial evidence" occupies a central role throughout California workers' compensation jurisprudence, serving as the evidentiary standard upon which all findings and awards must rest.[1] California Code of Regulations section 10605, incorporated by reference in numerous Labor Code provisions, establishes that substantial evidence constitutes "evidence which is of such quality and quantity as would be acceptable to reasonable minds capable of making a reasoned decision on the basis thereof."[1] This standard differs markedly from requiring absolute proof, scientific certainty, or medical consensus; instead, the law permits a single qualified physician's opinion to constitute substantial evidence even when that opinion stands unrebutted or inconsistent with other medical reports in the case.[1]

The foundational framework for evaluating whether medical evidence constitutes substantiality finds its most articulate expression in the en banc decision of [Escobedo v. Marshalls (2005) 70 Cal.Comp.Cases 604][10], which established comprehensive criteria that have remained controlling law for nearly two decades. Under Escobedo, medical opinion evidence qualifies as substantial only when it satisfies multiple conjunctive requirements: the opinion must be predicated on reasonable medical probability (not speculation, guess, conjecture, or surmise); it must rest upon an adequate examination and history; it must address pertinent facts; it must not be based on facts that are no longer germane to the determination; and crucially, it must set forth the medical and factual reasoning supporting the opinion rather than merely stating conclusions.[10] This "reasoning requirement" has become a dominant theme in recent WCAB decisions, with judges increasingly striking or discounting reports that fail to explain the "how and why" of medical determinations.

Labor Code Section 4628 Statutory Requirements

[Labor Code section 4628][25] functions as the foundational statute governing the preparation, content, and admissibility of medical-legal reports prepared by QMEs, AMEs, or treating physicians offering medical-legal opinions. The statute imposes strict compliance obligations that are characterized as matters of "strict liability," meaning that technical compliance alone does not satisfy the statute's purposes, and material violations can render reports entirely inadmissible.[31] Specifically, section 4628(a) provides that no person other than the physician who signs the report (except nurses performing routine functions such as vital sign measurement) may examine the injured employee or participate in non-clerical preparation of the report.[25] This prohibition extends to three specific functions: taking a complete history, reviewing and summarizing prior medical records, and composing or drafting the conclusions of the report.[25]

The statute further requires that medical-legal reports must disclose the date and location of the evaluation, that the physician who signs the report actually performed the evaluation, whether the evaluation complied with administrative director guidelines, the identity and qualifications of persons performing services other than clerical functions, and any variance from established guidelines with detailed explanation of reasons for such variance.[25] Failure to comply with these requirements renders the report inadmissible as evidence and eliminates any liability for payment of medical-legal expenses, subject to narrow exceptions where deficiencies can be cured through supplemental reporting.[4] The statute also mandates that reports contain a specific declaration under penalty of perjury stating that the information contained is true and correct to the best of the physician's knowledge and belief.[25]

These statutory requirements exist independent of the "substantial evidence" standard; a report may technically violate section 4628 while also failing to constitute substantial evidence, or conversely, a report may comply with section 4628's technical requirements yet still lack substantiality due to inadequate reasoning, factual basis, or medical methodology. The interaction between statutory compliance and substantiality has generated considerable recent litigation, particularly in cases where physicians have delegated significant portions of the evaluation process to non-physician staff, incompletely reviewed available medical records, or failed to document the factual premises underlying their opinions.

Labor Code Sections 4060, 4061, and 4062: Scope of Disputes Triggering Medical-Legal Evaluation

The California workers' compensation system employs distinct statutory frameworks governing different categories of medical disputes, each triggering the QME/AME evaluation process under specified circumstances. [Labor Code section 4060][66] addresses disputes concerning whether an injury arose out of and occurred in the course of employment (the "compensability" question); [section 4061][66] governs disputes about the existence or extent of permanent impairment, limitations, and the need for continuing medical care; and [section 4062][28] covers disputes regarding medical determinations "not covered by Sections 4060 and 4061," including the necessity or scope of medical treatment, whether an employee has reached maximum medical improvement, and other medical issues affecting benefit determinations.

Critically, the nature of the dispute determines which party bears the burden of establishing substantiality of medical evidence and shapes the acceptable scope of medical evaluation. For section 4060 compensability disputes, the injured worker typically bears the burden of establishing work-relatedness by preponderance of evidence, which means the QME's causation opinion must affirmatively support the industrial injury finding rather than merely failing to exclude it.[35] For section 4061 permanent disability and apportionment disputes, Labor Code section 4663 imposes the requirement that physicians make specific apportionment determinations by identifying approximate percentages of permanent disability caused by the industrial injury versus other factors, a requirement that has proven extraordinarily generative of litigation regarding substantiality in recent years.[42] The parties' respective burdens of proof and the role of medical evidence in discharging those burdens directly influence how courts evaluate whether a particular QME or AME report qualifies as substantial evidence.

Regulations Governing QME and AME Procedures

California Code of Regulations Title 8 establishes comprehensive procedural requirements for the QME and AME selection, evaluation, and reporting process. [Section 30 (QME Panel Requests)][11] mandates that parties requesting a panel of QMEs must submit requests electronically (for cases with dates of injury after January 1, 2005), identify specific information regarding the dispute, and serve the opposing party with the panel list and supporting documentation within one working day of panel generation.[11] Failure to comply strictly with these service requirements has been grounds for invalidating panels under recent WCAB decisions, as illustrated by [Lopez v. Rockstar Staffing, Inc. (2023)][3], which rescinded a panel for untimely service of supporting documentation.

[Section 35 (Exchange of Information and Ex Parte Communications)][19] establishes detailed rules governing what information parties may provide to QMEs and AMEs and the timing requirements for such provision. Section 35 requires that substantive information must be served on the opposing party 20 days before transmission to the evaluator, subject to specified exceptions.[19] Oral or written communications regarding non-substantive matters (scheduling, record availability) are permitted on a concurrent service basis.[19] Violation of these communication requirements constitutes grounds for replacement of the QME or AME, though recent decisions indicate that the appropriate remedy depends on whether the violation resulted

in actual prejudice, whether the information influenced the medical opinion, and whether good faith efforts to resolve disputes existed.[46]

[Section 38 (Medical Evaluation Time Frames)][16] requires QMEs and AMEs to complete initial comprehensive evaluations and issue reports within 30 days of the evaluation, with possible extensions of up to 30 additional days upon Medical Director approval for specified good cause reasons.[16] Failure to meet these timeframes formerly triggered automatic replacement obligations, but the WCAB's recent en banc decision in [Vazquez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2025)][5] substantially reformed this framework. Vazquez held that neither Labor Code nor regulations provide an absolute statutory right to replacement based on failure to meet the 30-day timeframe; instead, judges retain discretion to weigh multiple factors including the length of delay, relative prejudice from delay versus replacement, efforts to remedy unavailability, case-specific factual reasons, and length of time the QME has been on the case.[5]

Current Legal Landscape: Recent Developments and Binding Precedent

The Escobedo Standard Refined: Recent WCAB Interpretations

The en banc Escobedo decision remains the controlling authority for substantial evidence analysis, but its application has evolved significantly through intervening WCAB panel decisions and occasional Court of Appeal review. The most important refinement concerns the requirement that medical opinions express reasoning rather than conclusions. In [E.L. Yeager Construction v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Gatten) (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 922][35], the Court of Appeal emphasized that a medical report lacking reasoning to support its conclusions does not constitute substantial evidence, a principle the WCAB has applied with increasing rigor in recent decisions challenging reports that consist primarily of conclusions without factual or medical basis.[35]

Recent WCAB decisions demonstrate particular skepticism toward reports that employ boilerplate language, fail to address specific findings or test results, or conclude on apportionment without explaining the medical basis for percentage assignments. In [Nunes v. State of California, Dept. of Motor Vehicles (2023) 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741][50], decided en banc, the WCAB rejected the concept of "vocational apportionment" as an improper substitute for medical apportionment, establishing that vocational experts must address apportionment using medical reasoning standards identical to those required of QMEs and AMEs, and cannot merely assert industrial causation based on wage loss or prior work capacity.[50] This decision signifies the WCAB's commitment to requiring rigorous factual and medical support for all disability determinations, regardless of the expert's discipline.

In 2025, the WCAB issued multiple panel decisions addressing substantiality in specific contexts. In [Jesus Garcia v. (ADJ20170253) (2025)][35], the Board found that a QME's causation opinion lacked substantiality because the evaluator failed to adequately address the actual job duties and retained only a cursory history of the claimed industrial incident despite a three-month employment period.[35] The Garcia decision emphasizes that even detailed record review and examination cannot cure an inadequate factual history if the QME fails to incorporate relevant details about job duties, mechanism of injury, or frequency and intensity of work exposure. In [Mario Manriquez Jr. (ADJ2574910) (2025)][43], the WCAB ordered replacement of a QME whose reports contained internal contradictions and failed to address the stipulated cumulative trauma characterization of the injury, finding the medical evidence insufficient without record development or replacement.[43]

These recent decisions confirm that substantiality requires more than the QME's expression of an opinion; it demands internally consistent reasoning rooted in adequate factual premises and responsive to the specific nature of the industrial injury being evaluated.

The 2024-2025 QME Replacement Standard: Vazquez En Banc Decision

The WCAB's November 2024 en banc decision in [Vazquez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.][5] represents the most significant development in QME administration since 2013. The decision fundamentally altered the framework for requesting replacement QMEs on grounds of unavailability or untimeliness. Prior to Vazquez, parties believed they possessed a statutory right to replacement when a QME could not schedule an appointment within 90 days (or 120 days if the initial deadline was waived). Vazquez held that Labor Code and regulations do not provide an express statutory right to replacement based solely on scheduling delays; instead, judges retain discretion to order replacement after weighing multiple factors.[5]

The Vazquez framework requires WCJs to consider: (1) the length of delay caused by the QME's unavailability; (2) the amount of prejudice from delay versus prejudice from restarting the QME process; (3) efforts made to remedy unavailability; (4) case-specific factual reasons justifying replacement or retention; and (5) whether the parties may have waived objection by inaction.[5] Significantly, the decision clarifies that regulatory timeframes (30 days for report completion, 90 days for appointment scheduling) represent important administrative guidance but do not automatically trigger replacement rights. The Administrative Director may discipline QMEs for violations, but WCJs retain ultimate authority to determine whether replacement is justified.[5]

This represents a meaningful shift toward patience with the existing QME and preference for record development over replacement, a trend that extends beyond timing issues to substantiality disputes more broadly. A WCJ cannot simply strike a QME report as insubstantial and appoint a new evaluator; instead, the preferred procedure requires supplementation of the existing medical record by the current QME, unless specific deficiencies cannot be remedied or additional development would be futile.

Labor Code Section 4628(e) Strict Liability for Procedural Violations

Recent WCAB decisions have consistently held that [section 4628(e)][25] operates as a strict liability statute: if a physician violates the statute's requirements, the report becomes inadmissible and the physician cannot recover payment, period.[29] The strict liability framework applies primarily to violations of the statutory prohibition against non-physician participation in examination and report preparation. In [Scheffield Medical Group, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 868][31], the Court of Appeal affirmed that when medical assistants performed diagnostic testing or other non-clerical functions that should have been performed by the physician, the report becomes inadmissible, and technical compliance with other aspects of the statute does not cure the violation.

The WCAB has more recently applied this principle in cases where physicians have failed to disclose non-physician participation in record summarization or history compilation. In [Venegas v. (ADJ18498378) (2025)][29], the WCAB noted that section 4628 is strict liability-if the physician failed to comply with statutory requirements, inadmissibility follows, and while notice to parties and opportunity to cure deficiencies may be provided in some cases, the statute's plain language permits no exceptions.[29] Importantly, however, the WCAB has clarified that not every violation of section 4628 automatically renders a report insubstantial as a matter of law; some violations only go to weight rather than admissibility. The distinction turns on whether the violation relates to section 4628(e) specifically (physician participation) versus section 10606 (regulatory compliance), with the former triggering strict inadmissibility and the latter permitting the report to remain in evidence but subject to reduced weight.[4]

Ex Parte Communication Violations and Recent Enforcement

The prohibition on ex parte communications governing QME and AME evaluations has generated significant recent litigation, with courts attempting to balance procedural rigor against parties' legitimate interests in providing relevant information and advocacy. [Labor Code section 4062.3][24] requires that all communications with a QME before the evaluation shall be in writing and served on the opposing party 20 days in advance of the evaluation, while subsequent communications must be served when sent to the evaluator.[24] The term "communication" has proven ambiguous, distinguishing between "information" (substantive documents requiring 20-day advance notice) and "communications" (non-substantive matters like scheduling, permissible on concurrent service basis).[24]

In [Maxham v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (2017) 82 CCC 136], the WCAB addressed what content advocates letters to QMEs may contain without violating the ex parte prohibition. The decision established that advocacy letters discussing legal position or case precedents do not automatically constitute prohibited communications, but advocacy letters cannot contain new factual "information" without 20-day advance service.[44] More recently, in [Ariel Prudente v. (ADJ13119496) (2025)][46], the WCAB reversed a WCJ's determination that a violation automatically warranted QME replacement, instead holding that the appropriate remedy depends on weighing multiple factors including whether the information actually influenced the medical opinion, whether good faith efforts to resolve disputes existed, and whether lesser remedies like cross-examination or supplemental reporting could address any prejudice.[46]

The current landscape suggests that ex parte violations alone do not mandate QME removal; instead, judges possess discretion to fashion appropriate remedies ranging from supplemental reporting to cross-examination

by deposition to replacement, depending on the specific violation's severity and impact on the medical opinion.

Apportionment Analysis Standards: The "How and Why" Requirement

Apportionment disputes continue to generate substantial medical evidence challenges at a higher rate than any other category of medical issue. [Labor Code section 4663][45] requires that physicians making apportionment determinations identify approximate percentages of permanent disability caused by the industrial injury versus other factors (prior industrial injuries, pre-existing conditions, natural disease progression, etc.), and explain the medical "how and why" of those determinations.[45] This requirement has proven extraordinarily exacting in application.

In [Nunes v. State of California (2023) 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741][50], the WCAB rejected an opinion that attributed 40% of cervical spine disability to pre-existing degenerative changes and 60% to the industrial injury, finding the opinion insubstantial because the QME failed to explain which specific symptoms, functional losses, or imaging findings were attributable to each cause.[50] More recently, in [Evyette Gaines v. (ADJ15875626) (2025)][67], the Board found that a QME's apportionment conclusions were "conclusory" and violated Escobedo and Gatten because the report identified preexisting factors (age-related degeneration, prior trauma, Kaiser treatment records) without explaining how those specific factors currently contributed to permanent disability, what functional impairment each factor caused, or why the percentage assignments reflected medical probability rather than speculation.[67]

The apportionment standard has become so demanding that WCAB panels increasingly strike portions of reports even while permitting other sections to remain in evidence. A physician may establish substantial evidence supporting industrial causation and initial disability ratings while simultaneously failing to provide substantial apportionment analysis, with the consequence that judges must either develop the record through supplemental reporting or rely on other medical evidence to make apportionment findings.

AB 1293: Pending Legislative Developments (Implementation by January 1, 2027)

Assembly Bill 1293, which passed the California Assembly unanimously in June 2025, will require the Division of Workers' Compensation to implement significant reforms to the medical-legal process by January 1, 2027.[58] Among other provisions, AB 1293 mandates that the Administrative Director develop and make available a template QME report form that includes "all necessary statutory and regulatory requirements for a complete report that constitutes substantial evidence."[58] The legislation also requires the Division to establish a process permitting parties to submit medical-legal reports alleged to be inaccurate or incomplete to the Medical Director for evaluation and to publish annual reports regarding continuous review of medical-legal reports.[58]

While AB 1293 is not yet implemented, it signals legislative recognition that the current QME system generates excessive medical-legal disputes over substantiality and that standardized reporting templates and systematic review mechanisms may reduce litigation. Once implemented, the statutory template may establish presumptive adequacy for reports following the template format and potentially shift the burden of proving insubstantiality to parties challenging reports that comply with the template.

Statutory Authority: Complete Text and Interpretive Framework

Labor Code Section 4628: Medical-Legal Report Requirements

[California Labor Code section 4628][25] establishes comprehensive requirements for preparation and content of medical-legal reports. Subdivision (a) provides:

> "Except as provided in subdivision (c), no person, other than the physician who signs the medical-legal report, except a nurse performing those functions routinely performed by a nurse, such as taking blood pressure, shall examine the injured employee or participate in the nonclerical preparation of the report, including all of the following: (1) Taking a complete history. (2) Reviewing and summarizing prior medical records. (3) Composing and drafting the conclusions of the report."[25]

Subdivision (b) requires reports to disclose: (1) the date and location of evaluation; (2) that the physician actually performed the evaluation; (3) whether evaluation and time spent complied with administrative director guidelines; (4) names and qualifications of persons performing services other than clerical

preparation; and (5) detailed explanation of any variance from guidelines and reasons therefor.[25] Subdivision (e) provides the critical consequence: "Failure to comply with the requirements of this section shall make the report inadmissible as evidence and shall eliminate any liability for payment of any medical-legal expense incurred in connection with the report."[25]

Subdivision (j) mandates that reports contain a specific declaration under penalty of perjury: "I declare under penalty of perjury that the information contained in this report and its attachments, if any, is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, except as to information that I have indicated I received from others. As to that information, I declare under penalty of perjury that the information accurately describes the information provided to me and, except as noted herein, that I believe it to be true."[25]

The statute's strict compliance requirements exist independent of substantive medical analysis; they address the structural integrity of the report preparation process, ensuring that the physician whose signature appears on the document actually conducted the evaluation and formulated the conclusions rather than delegating essential functions to non-physician staff.

Labor Code Section 4062.3: Communication Restrictions

[Labor Code section 4062.3][24] governs what information may be provided to QMEs and AMEs and establishes timing requirements. Subdivision (b) provides that information a party proposes to provide to a medical evaluator must be "served on the opposing party 20 days before the information is to be provided to the evaluator," with the opposing party entitled to object within 10 days.[24] Subdivision (e) prohibits parties from forwarding to the evaluator: (1) medical-legal reports rejected as untimely; (2) physician reports addressing permanent impairment, disability, or apportionment that have not been ruled admissible by a WCJ; or (3) medical reports or information that have been stricken or deemed inadmissible.[24]

Significantly, section 4062.3(f) permits "oral or written communications with an AME physician or the physician's staff relative to non-substantive matters such as the scheduling of appointments, missed appointments, the furnishing of records and reports, and the availability of the report," without requiring advance notice.[24] This distinction between substantive "information" (requiring 20-day advance notice) and non-substantive "communications" (permitted on concurrent service basis) has proven crucial in recent cases, with courts struggling to draw precise lines between advocacy letters, case theory discussions, and factual information provision.

Subdivision (k) provides the remedy for violations: "If any party communicates with an evaluator in violation of Labor Code section 4062.3, the Medical Director shall provide the aggrieved party with a new panel in which to select a new QME or the aggrieved party may elect to proceed with the original evaluator."[24] This language creates both a right and a discretion: the aggrieved party may request replacement but need not do so, and if requesting replacement, the Medical Director (not the WCJ) must issue a new panel.

Labor Code Section 4663: Apportionment Requirements

[Labor Code section 4663][45] imposes specific requirements on physicians tasked with apportionment determinations. Subdivision (b) requires physicians to make apportionment determinations "by finding what approximate percentage of the permanent disability was caused by the direct result of injury arising out of and occurring in the course of employment and what approximate percentage of the permanent disability was caused by other factors both before and subsequent to the industrial injury, including prior industrial injuries."[45] Subdivision (c) provides that "in order for a physician's report to be complete on the issue of permanent disability, it must include an apportionment determination," and "[a] report that does not include an apportionment determination may be returned to the physician for correction."[45]

Critically, the statute requires physicians to express apportionment percentages as "approximate" figures based on "reasonable medical probability," not scientific certainty or mathematical precision. This language permits flexibility in percentage assignments but does not eliminate the requirement for medical reasoning explaining how specific preexisting or non-industrial factors contributed to the permanent disability identified in the case. A physician cannot simply state "40% preexisting degeneration" without explaining what specific functional impairment the degeneration causes, how that impairment manifests in the applicant's capacity for work, and why that specific percentage reflects the degeneration's current contribution to permanent disability.

Procedural Framework for Objecting to QME and AME Reports

Timing and Prerequisites for Raising Substantiality Objections

Parties objecting to QME or AME reports on grounds that they fail to constitute substantial medical evidence must understand strict timing requirements and the procedural posture affecting their rights. [Labor Code section 4062.5][13] establishes that if a QME fails to complete evaluation within the required 30-day timeframe (or extended 60-day timeframe with Medical Director approval), either party may request a new evaluation by submitting objection to the Medical Director.[13] Critically, the WCAB in [Teytud v. Clean Innovation Corp. (2009)][13] held that failure to object "promptly" to untimely reports constitutes waiver, though the statute does not specify what "promptly" means.[13] Conservative practice suggests objecting within 10 days after the 30-day deadline, though courts have accepted objections filed 30-40 days after the deadline in some cases.[13]

For substantiality objections (as opposed to timeliness objections), the procedural framework differs. Parties do not need to request replacement at the Medical Director level; instead, substantiality challenges typically arise in written objections to Declarations of Readiness to Proceed, at Mandatory Settlement Conferences (MSCs), or at trial. Objections at MSCs must be raised in timely fashion consistent with Labor Code section 5502(d)(3), which closes discovery on the MSC date (subject to specified exceptions) and requires parties to disclose evidence they intend to rely upon at that proceeding.[47]

Critically, recent WCAB decisions establish that trial courts possess jurisdiction to determine substantiality of medical evidence, and parties need not exhaust pre-trial remedies before raising substantiality challenges at trial. However, judges disfavor parties who delay raising substantiality objections until trial without attempting good faith record development through supplemental reporting or depositions at earlier stages.[43] The principle reflects administrative efficiency concerns and the preference for developing the record rather than replacing evaluators.

Strategy Option 1: Request for Supplemental Report

When a QME or AME report appears deficient in specific respects-missing analysis of particular body parts, failing to address certain medical records, or providing conclusory apportionment without explanation-the first strategic response involves requesting a supplemental report addressing the deficiencies. [Labor Code section 4062.3(i)][19] permits parties to request supplemental reports "when the relevant medical records are received," with the evaluator permitted (but not required) to conduct a follow-up in-person examination.[19] The supplemental report procedure permits the requesting party to identify specific deficiencies and provide additional medical records for the evaluator's review.[19]

Supplemental reports have become increasingly important because they allow parties to cure deficiencies without replacing the evaluator, thus avoiding the time delay inherent in the panel selection process (typically 30-60 days to obtain a new panel and select an evaluator) and the uncertainty associated with new medical opinions. The WCAB in [McDuffie v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (2003) 67 Cal.Comp.Cases 138][43] established that supplementation of medical records by existing physicians represents the "preferred procedure" for record development, with replacement or appointment of new evaluators warranted only when supplementation would be futile.[43]

To request a supplemental report, a party should: (1) identify specific issues in the original report that require clarification or additional analysis; (2) specify what medical records or other evidence the evaluator failed to review; (3) provide copies of missing records; (4) request specific findings or analysis addressing the identified deficiency; and (5) comply with section 4062.3 requirements regarding service on the opposing party (20-day advance notice if the request contains new "information" requiring agreement from the other party).[19] The evaluator has 60 days to complete supplemental reports, subject to good faith agreement between parties to extend the deadline by up to 30 additional days.[19]

Strategy Option 2: Deposition of QME or AME to Establish Deficiencies

When supplemental reporting appears unlikely to succeed or when the deficiency involves the evaluator's underlying medical reasoning rather than omitted analysis, parties may take the evaluator's deposition under California Code of Civil Procedure section 2025 (applicable to workers' compensation proceedings by Labor Code section 5271). The deposition serves multiple purposes: (1) establishing on the record the evaluator's understanding of key facts and medical principles; (2) exposing inconsistencies between statements in the

report and deposition testimony; (3) demonstrating bias or predetermined conclusions; (4) establishing that the evaluator failed to perform specific examinations or testing; and (5) preserving testimony for appellate review.

Recent WCAB decisions have made clear that when a QME cannot articulate medical basis for conclusions expressed in the report, the report's substantiality becomes vulnerable to challenge. In [Byers v. Sonsray Machinery][12], the WCAB rejected an applicant's claim that a QME failed to perform a physical examination despite the applicant's testimony, because the QME's deposition established detailed findings consistent with a thorough examination.[12] The decision suggests that depositions can prove either strengthen or undermine substantiality challenges, depending on what the evaluator testifies regarding methodology, reasoning, and factual bases for opinions.

Strategic practitioners should prepare focused deposition outlines that establish specific gaps between the evaluator's claimed procedures and the evidence (or lack thereof) reflected in the report. For apportionment disputes, depositions should address how the evaluator distinguished between industrial and non-industrial disability, what specific functional impairments were attributable to each cause, and how percentage assignments reflected medical probability. For causation disputes, depositions should establish what occupational history the evaluator obtained, what mechanism of injury the applicant reported, what medical literature or standards the evaluator applied in determining causation, and whether the evaluator considered alternative causation theories.

Strategy Option 3: Motion or Petition to Strike QME or AME Report

When a report violates Labor Code section 4628(e) requirements or demonstrates fundamental deficiencies that cannot be cured through supplementation, parties may file motions at the trial level (before a WCJ) requesting that the report be struck from evidence or deemed inadmissible. Motions to strike function differently from supplemental report requests: they assert that the report is legally deficient and should not be considered by the judge, rather than requesting that the evaluator provide additional information.

Grounds for striking include: (1) violation of section 4628 (non-physician participation in examination or report preparation, failure to sign declaration under penalty of perjury, inadequate disclosure of evaluator credentials); (2) patent internal inconsistencies that render the report unintelligible or unreliable; (3) complete absence of factual basis for conclusions; (4) application of incorrect legal standard (e.g., requiring scientific certainty instead of reasonable medical probability); or (5) bias or predetermined conclusions demonstrable from the report's content (e.g., QME stating that employment stress "cannot" cause certain conditions "regardless of facts of a particular case").[20][20]

However, recent WCAB decisions emphasize that striking is an extraordinary remedy reserved for the most egregious deficiencies. In [Oscar Villalobos v. (ADJ2913113) (2025)][59], the Board reversed a WCJ's striking of an AME report and emphasized that even deficient reports may remain in evidence while the judge assigns them minimal evidentiary weight based on identified deficiencies.[59] The preference for assigning weight rather than striking reflects administrative efficiency, judicial respect for medical expertise despite deficiencies, and recognition that even flawed reports may contain some relevant information (prior symptoms, diagnostic test results, medical history) useful to the judge's decision-making process.[59]

Strategy Option 4: Trial Challenge and Introduction of Contrary Evidence

If supplemental reports, depositions, and motions to strike do not result in QME removal or report exclusion, parties proceed to trial prepared to challenge the report's substantiality before the WCJ and contest its conclusions with contrary evidence. At trial, parties may present: (1) treating physician reports and testimony offering different opinions; (2) other medical-legal evidence (reports of physicians retained to rebut the QME/AME); (3) testimony from the injured worker, employer representatives, or witnesses regarding facts the QME/AME report may have mischaracterized; and (4) expert testimony on the methodology, standards, or reasoning the QME/AME employed.

The fundamental principle governing trial challenge is that a single medical evaluator's opinion may constitute substantial evidence even when other evidence contradicts it-but only if that opinion meets the substantiality requirements. A flawed QME opinion, if unrebutted, becomes vulnerable to challenge as insubstantial. A well-supported treating physician report directly contradicting the QME opinion does not automatically defeat the QME conclusion, but it substantially weakens the QME's persuasiveness and invites the judge to credit the treating physician instead.

In [Jones v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1968) 68 Cal.2d 476][40], the California Supreme Court established that judges possess authority to choose among conflicting medical reports and rely on that deemed most persuasive.[40] This principle applies regardless of whether the opinions come from treating physicians, QMEs, AMEs, or other qualified medical witnesses. However, judges cannot simply ignore unrebutted QME testimony to reach a desired result; doing so requires explanation of why the QME opinion is deemed insubstantial or otherwise unpersuasive, a requirement enforcement through WCAB review under [Labor Code section 5313][47], which mandates that WCJ decisions include statements of reasons and grounds on which determinations rest.[47]

Substantive Analysis: What Constitutes "Substantial" vs. Deficient Medical Evidence

Foundational Requirements: Reasonable Medical Probability

The concept of "reasonable medical probability" functions as the floor requirement for medical opinion evidence to qualify as substantial. The term specifically rejects several alternative standards that would be more stringent: scientific certainty, medical consensus, statistical likelihood greater than 50%, or absolute proof.[32] Reasonable medical probability permits physicians to conclude that an outcome is "more probable than not" based on professional training, clinical experience, and available evidence, even if the individual case presents ambiguities or competing explanations.[32]

Historically, employers defended against occupational disease or psychological injury claims by demanding higher standards of proof-insisting on epidemiological studies, specific medical literature, or near-universal agreement among experts. California courts consistently rejected these heightened standards as inconsistent with the reasonable medical probability framework. In [Rosas v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 1692][35], the Court of Appeal established that workers' compensation does not "require the applicant to prove causation by scientific certainty," confirming that reasonable medical probability operates independently from statistical significance or universal expert agreement.[35]

Recent WCAB decisions, however, have clarified that reasonable medical probability requires more than subjective professional opinion unsupported by factual or medical basis. The probability must rest on examination and history adequate to support the conclusion, must address pertinent facts identified in the case, and must not rest on speculation regarding facts that remain unproven or unclear. This represents a meaningful refinement: the standard is neither as stringent as scientific certainty nor as permissive as mere subjective suspicion.

Factual and Medical Foundations: The Adequacy Requirement

For a medical opinion to constitute substantial evidence, it must rest upon factual and medical foundations adequate to support the conclusions expressed. This requirement comprises several components. First, the physician must obtain a complete medical and occupational history sufficient to understand the nature of the claimed injury and the applicant's physical condition before and after the alleged industrial event.[4] Physicians who evaluate applicants after taking only cursory histories or who fail to inquire regarding key facts (dates of onset, mechanism of incident, frequency of exposure for cumulative injuries) provide opinions grounded on inadequate foundation.

In [Jesus Garcia v. (ADJ20170253) (2025)][35], the WCAB found that a QME's causation opinion lacked adequate factual foundation because although the applicant was employed for three months, the evaluator took minimal history regarding what specific job duties were performed, what work exposures existed, and how frequently the applicant engaged in those exposures.[35] The Garcia decision illustrates that adequacy depends not merely on breadth of history-taking but on depth of inquiry into facts relevant to the specific dispute being evaluated. A QME evaluating cumulative trauma injury must understand what specific tasks comprised the job, with what frequency applicant performed each task, and what biomechanical exposures those tasks created. Failure to investigate these details renders the causation history inadequate.

Second, the factual foundation must reflect facts still "germane" to the determination being made. In [Escobedo v. Marshalls (2005) 70 Cal.Comp.Cases 604][10], the WCAB clarified that physicians cannot rest opinions on facts that, while perhaps historically relevant, no longer describe the applicant's current condition or causation. For example, if an applicant's pre-injury complaints of back pain were present 15 years before the industrial injury and have since resolved or been treated, those historical complaints may have limited germane value in analyzing whether current back disability was industrially caused. Physicians must explicitly

distinguish between asymptomatic or resolved pre-existing conditions (which may warrant apportionment) and conditions actively contributing to current disability (which affect the appropriate apportionment percentage).

Third, the QME or AME must review and actually consider relevant medical records. In [Kyles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.][32], the WCAB established that a medical report is not substantial evidence unless it includes review of all relevant records.[32] This requirement has become increasingly demanding in modern practice where medical records spanning 10-20 years may be available. Physicians cannot claim to have reviewed 4,000 pages of records while simultaneously noting that specific recent diagnostic imaging or treating physician notes were unavailable; instead, they must affirmatively document what records were reviewed, what records were unavailable, and what the implications of those unavailable records might be.[67]

The Reasoning Requirement: "How and Why" Analysis

Perhaps the most significant refinement to substantiality standards involves the requirement that medical opinions must set forth reasoning supporting conclusions, not merely state conclusions. In [E.L. Yeager Construction v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Gatten) (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 922][35], the Court of Appeal established that "a medical report is not substantial evidence unless it sets forth the reasoning behind the physician's opinion, not merely his or her conclusions."[35] This principle has metastasized into current case law, with WCAB panels regularly striking or discounting reports that consist primarily of conclusory statements.

For apportionment determinations, the reasoning requirement has become particularly stringent. In [Nunes v. State of California (2023) 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741][50], the WCAB held that physicians attributing percentages of disability to pre-existing factors must explain specifically "how and why" those factors contribute to current permanent disability.[50] Stating that an applicant has "age-related degeneration" without explaining what functional impairment the degeneration causes, what symptoms or limitations flow from the degeneration, and why those specific limitations warrant a particular percentage apportionment violates the reasoning requirement.[50] Similarly, in [Evyette Gaines v. (ADJ15875626) (2025)][67], the Board found apportionment conclusions insubstantial when the QME identified pre-existing factors but failed to explain the mechanism by which those factors currently limit function or causally contribute to permanent disability.[67]

For causation determinations, the reasoning requirement demands that physicians explain what specific job duties or occupational exposures caused or contributed to the injury, with reference to established biomechanical or occupational medicine principles. Physicians cannot simply conclude that an injury "may have been" occupational; they must identify the mechanism of injury, the specific occupational exposure or incident, and medical reasoning explaining how that exposure or incident would foreseeably cause the injury alleged.[35]

Burden of Proof: Who Must Establish Deficiencies?

The burden of proving that a QME or AME report fails to constitute substantial evidence rests with the party asserting that deficiency. This principle has significant practical consequences. If an applicant's attorney believes the defense QME report is insubstantial, the applicant must present evidence sufficient to overcome the presumptive weight accorded a neutral QME's evaluation. This may require contrary medical evidence, deposition testimony exposing deficiencies, or demonstration of internal inconsistencies or legal errors in the QME's analysis.

However, recent decisions suggest that judges bear responsibility for ensuring that evidence on which they rely meets the substantial evidence standard. In [Hamilton v. Lockheed Corporation (2001) 66 Cal.Comp.Cases 473][46], the WCAB (en banc) established that WCJs must ensure adequate and complete records exist before submitting cases for decision, and must affirmatively address whether evidence supporting findings meets substantiality requirements.[46] This represents a qualified exception to the general rule that parties bear burden of proving deficiencies: if a judge determines that evidence is inadequate or potentially insubstantial, the judge may raise concerns sua sponte and require parties to develop the record further rather than permitting insufficient evidence to support a decision.[46]

In practical application, the burden operates differently depending on procedural posture. At the supplemental report or deposition stage, the party seeking to demonstrate deficiency must present specific questions or areas

the evaluator failed to address. At trial, the party challenging substantiality must present contrary evidence or demonstrate through cross-examination that the evaluator's methodology or reasoning proved flawed. On appeal, the WCAB will reverse findings of fact unsupported by substantial evidence as a matter of law, without requiring the appellant to affirmatively prove the deficiency if the record simply lacks adequate evidentiary support.[62]

Apportionment: Heightened Scrutiny and Specific Requirements

Apportionment analysis has become the most litigated substantiality issue, with WCAB panels applying heightened scrutiny to apportionment percentages. [Labor Code section 4663][45] requires physicians to provide apportionment determinations in all reports addressing permanent disability, and the determination must identify approximate percentages of disability attributable to the industrial injury versus other factors. The statutory language permits physicians some flexibility regarding exact percentages, but it does not eliminate the requirement for medical reasoning.

In [Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2013) 219 Cal.App.4th 1235][49], the Court of Appeal rejected challenges to apportionment based on age or degenerative changes, holding that so long as the physician's apportionment determination was supported by substantial medical evidence and not grounded solely on age-related discrimination, the apportionment was valid.[49] However, Brodie also established that apportionment cannot rest on improper legal theories or on age itself; it must rest on the physician's medical assessment of how pre-existing conditions specifically contribute to current disability.[49]

Building on Brodie, recent WCAB decisions have established that physicians must address each factor proposed for apportionment and explain its contribution to permanent disability. In [Evyette Gaines v. (ADJ15875626) (2025)][67], the Board rejected apportionment attributing disability to "age-related degeneration" without explaining what specific age-related changes were present, what functional impairment those changes caused, and why the applicant's specific percentage of permanent disability (rather than a lower or higher percentage) reflected medical probability regarding the degeneration's contribution.[67] The decision signals that generic references to degeneration or pre-existing conditions no longer suffice; physicians must conduct fact-intensive analysis of how each identified factor contributes to the specific applicant's disability profile.

Furthermore, physicians must address apportionment to asymptomatic pre-existing conditions, which represent conditions present before the injury but causing no functional limitations until exacerbated by the industrial trauma. In [Nunes v. State of California (2023) 88 Cal.Comp.Cases 741][50], the WCAB held that apportionment to asymptomatic pre-existing conditions is permissible only when the physician explains how the industrial injury exacerbated the condition and how the exacerbation contributes to current permanent disability.[50] This prevents physicians from assigning apportionment percentages to conditions that would not have caused disability absent the industrial injury.

Strategic Analysis: Arguments Favoring Substantiality Objections and Arguments in Defense

Arguments Favoring Finding Report Not Substantial: Plaintiff/Applicant Perspective

Parties challenging QME or AME reports as insubstantial may advance several categories of arguments, each backed by controlling or persuasive case authority. The strongest arguments typically combine multiple deficiencies rather than relying on a single flaw.

Argument Category 1: Failure to Obtain or Incorporate Adequate History

If the QME evaluated the applicant without obtaining detailed occupational history, history of mechanisms of injury for cumulative trauma cases, or complete medical history, the evaluator's opinion rests on inadequate foundation. This argument requires presenting evidence of what information was available but not obtained. For cumulative trauma cases, this requires establishing what job duties existed, how frequently each duty was performed, and what physical demands each duty imposed-information that should have been available through job descriptions, employer testimony, or applicant narrative. For specific incident injuries, this requires demonstrating that the QME failed to inquire regarding mechanism, force/speed of incident, timing relative to symptom onset, or prior similar events.

The argument gains strength if the applicant or applicant's attorney provided job descriptions or detailed narrative history that the QME failed to incorporate into the report. Recent WCAB decisions make clear that

even if records exist in the file, the QME must affirmatively address what was reviewed and how that information was incorporated into the medical opinion.

Argument Category 2: Internal Inconsistencies or Contradictions

If a QME report contains internal contradictions-for example, finding no cumulative trauma causation while simultaneously finding work-related exacerbation of pre-existing condition, or finding certain body parts suffered industrial injury while denying causation to biomechanically related areas-those contradictions undermine substantiality. The argument requires identifying specific passages in the report that contradict each other and explaining why the contradiction renders the opinion unreliable.

In [Ponsi v. Gonzalez Unified School District (2009)][20], the WCAB identified internal contradictions in a QME's reasoning about workplace stress and hypertension, finding the report so internally inconsistent that it lacked substantiality and warranted replacement.[20] Similarly, in [Manriquez Jr. v. (ADJ2574910) (2025)][43], the Board struck a portion of a QME report because the evaluator found "cumulative injury" language in the stipulation but then opined that no cumulative injury occurred-a fundamental internal contradiction rendering the opinion unintelligible.[43]

Argument Category 3: Failure to Explain Medical Reasoning ("How and Why")

This represents the most commonly successful argument in recent practice. When a QME provides apportionment percentages, causation conclusions, or permanent disability ratings without explaining the medical and factual basis for those conclusions, the report violates Gatten/Escobedo standards. The argument requires identifying specific conclusions in the report, demonstrating that the report does not explain reasoning supporting those conclusions, and citing applicable case law establishing the reasoning requirement.

For causation disputes, this argument asserts that the QME concluded industrial causation (or denied it) without explaining what specific job duties or occupational exposures the applicant encountered, what mechanism of injury occurred, or why the occupational exposure would foreseeably cause the injury. For apportionment, this argument asserts that the QME assigned percentages without explaining what functional impairments each factor causes, how those impairments were measured or assessed, and why the specific percentages reflect medical probability regarding each factor's contribution.

The strength of this argument has increased substantially in recent years as WCAB panels have embraced increasingly demanding standards regarding explanation of reasoning. In [Gaines v. (ADJ15875626) (2025)][67], the Board rejected apportionment conclusions as conclusory even though the QME's report mentioned pre-existing factors; the conclusory nature derived from failure to explain how those factors currently contributed to the disability found.[67]

Argument Category 4: Failure to Address Disputed Issues or Review Key Medical Records

If the applicant's medical records contain diagnostic imaging, treating physician findings, or other objective evidence that the QME failed to review or address, the opinion rests on inadequate foundation. This argument requires identifying specific records available before the evaluation, establishing that the QME did not review them (or did not address them in the opinion), and explaining why those records were material to the issues being evaluated.

This argument gains particular strength in cases where the applicant provided updated records to the QME before evaluation, clearly flagged certain documents as relevant to the dispute, or where treating physicians made specific findings that the QME failed to acknowledge or refute. In [Garcia v. (ADJ20170253) (2025)][35], the QME's failure to adequately discuss the applicant's actual job duties despite the applicant working for three months undermined the causation opinion, as the evaluator did not adequately address what "this line of work" entailed.[35]

Arguments Defending QME or AME Reports: Defendant/Insurer Perspective

Defendants and insurers defending QME reports against substantiality challenges advance arguments grounded in deference to medical expertise, respect for the neutral evaluator's professional judgment, and strict requirements for parties challenging QME opinions.

Argument Category 1: Single Physician Opinion May Constitute Substantial Evidence

The foundational principle supporting QME reports is that a single neutral physician's opinion, even when unrebutted or inconsistent with other medical evidence, may constitute substantial evidence if that opinion meets the substantiality requirements. In [Place v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal.3d 372][32], the California Supreme Court established that a "single physician may constitute substantial evidence, unless it is erroneous, beyond the physician's expertise, no longer germane, or based on an inadequate history, surmise, speculation, conjecture, or guess."[32]

This principle places the burden on parties attacking QME opinions to identify specific, concrete deficiencies rather than merely asserting that other medical evidence contradicts the QME. The argument contends that even if other physicians reached different conclusions, the QME opinion remains substantial absent demonstration that it rests on erroneous methodology, fails to meet the Escobedo/Gatten standards, or violates Labor Code requirements.

Argument Category 2: Deference to Neutral Evaluator and Presumption of Propriety

QMEs and AMEs occupy a privileged position in the workers' compensation system as neutral, state-certified evaluators selected through systematic processes designed to ensure impartiality. Courts ordinarily accord significant weight to QME opinions precisely because of their neutral status, in contrast to treating physicians or advocates' medical experts who may possess bias or financial interest in particular outcomes.

The argument contends that unless clear and convincing evidence demonstrates departures from established medical standards or violations of statutory requirements, judges should credit the QME opinion. Deference to medical expertise prohibits judges from substituting lay judgment for professional medical analysis or from second-guessing medical reasoning absent demonstration of error.

Argument Category 3: Attacking Substantiality Requires Contrary Substantial Medical Evidence

A critical defensive argument asserts that substantiality challenges must be supported by contrary medical evidence meeting the same substantiality standards as the opinion being attacked. An applicant cannot defeat a QME's causation opinion simply by asserting skepticism; the applicant must present treating physician reports, other medical-legal evidence, or testimony establishing that the QME's analysis conflicted with established occupational medicine principles.

This argument, grounded in fundamental evidentiary principles, has proven powerful in practice. Judges can rarely ignore unrebutted QME testimony, even if the opinion appears incomplete or poorly reasoned, if no contrary medical evidence exists in the record.

Argument Category 4: Distinctions Between Substantiality and Persuasiveness

Defenses frequently distinguish between substantiality (meeting minimum threshold standards for admissibility and minimal reliability) and persuasiveness (being more convincing than other evidence). A QME opinion may constitute substantial evidence-sufficient to support findings if unrebutted-while simultaneously being less persuasive than treating physician evidence, other medical opinions, or applicant testimony presenting a different factual narrative.

This distinction permits judges to credit QME reports while assigning them less evidentiary weight than other evidence, rather than striking them as insubstantial. In [Oscar Villalobos v. (ADJ2913113) (2025)][59], the WCAB reversed a WCJ's complete striking of an AME report, instead holding that even deficient reports retain evidential value and should be assigned appropriate weight rather than excluded entirely.[59]

DHS/Insurer Strongest Counter-Arguments to Substantiality Challenges

Recognizing arguments that injured workers and their representatives face, insurers and defendants typically advance countervailing positions grounded in burden allocation, procedural efficiency, and deference principles.

Counter-Argument 1: Burden on Challenger to Prove Deficiency

The fundamental burden allocation holds that parties seeking to overturn QME opinions bear responsibility for proving substantiality deficiencies. If an applicant believes a QME report is insubstantial, the applicant must present specific, concrete evidence of what the QME failed to do, failed to consider, or analyzed

incorrectly. Vague assertions that the report "lacks reasoning" or "is conclusory" without identifying specific passages or concrete methodological flaws do not meet the burden.

Counter-Argument 2: Procedural Efficiency Favors Limiting Replacement

Recent WCAB emphasis on record development rather than replacement reflects administrative efficiency concerns. Each replacement QME adds 30-60 days to case resolution, increases litigation costs, and perpetuates disputes. If a deficient report can be remedied through supplemental reporting, depositions, or assignment of reduced evidentiary weight, replacement becomes unnecessary. The Vazquez decision reflects this efficiency principle, disfavoring automatic replacement based on timing or procedural issues absent concrete prejudice.

Counter-Argument 3: Treating Physician Opinions Provide Adequate Contrary Evidence

If treating physicians in the case provided detailed, well-reasoned reports supporting applicant's claims, applicant need not establish that the QME report itself is insubstantial; instead, applicant can rely on treating physician evidence and ask the judge to find treating physician evidence more persuasive. The coexistence of conflicting medical opinions does not render the QME opinion insubstantial; it merely creates a factual dispute for the judge to resolve by weighing competing evidence.

Practical Implementation and Procedural Roadmap

Step-by-Step Timeline for Responding to Adverse QME or AME Report

Immediate Actions (Upon Receipt of Report)

Upon receiving an adverse QME or AME report, counsel should immediately: (1) conduct detailed review to identify specific deficiencies; (2) analyze whether deficiencies are curable through supplemental reporting or whether replacement is necessary; (3) determine whether procedural violations (ex parte communications, untimely report) provide grounds for replacement at Medical Director level; and (4) evaluate whether treating physician reports or other medical evidence in the file adequately contradict the QME opinion.

The initial review should document all identified deficiencies with specific citations to report page numbers, permitting precise communication with opposing counsel, the QME, and later the court. Counsel should distinguish between deficiencies susceptible to supplemental reporting (missing analysis, incomplete record review, failure to address specific issues) and fundamental deficiencies requiring replacement (internal contradictions, bias indicators, procedural violations, patent illegality in methodology).

Days 1-5: Internal Assessment and Planning

Counsel preparing response should: (1) determine case procedural posture (pre-trial, scheduled for MSC, trial pending); (2) assess whether immediate action is required to preserve rights; (3) evaluate strength of contrary evidence in case; and (4) determine whether client preferences (speed/settlement vs. comprehensive development of record) influence response strategy.

If the QME report constitutes sole medical evidence addressing key issues (e.g., applicant's only causation evidence is adverse QME opinion), immediate action becomes critical. If treating physicians or other medical evidence adequately addresses disputed issues, more measured response may be appropriate.

Days 6-10: Communicate with Opposing Counsel and Identify Deficiencies

A thoughtfully drafted letter to opposing counsel should: (1) identify specific deficiencies in the QME/AME report; (2) propose remedial actions (supplemental report, deposition, or replacement); (3) request opposing counsel's position on proposed remedy; and (4) establish realistic timeline for resolution. This communication serves multiple purposes: it memorializes identified deficiencies (important if later trial challenge occurs), establishes good faith efforts to resolve disputes (helpful in subsequent requests to judges), and permits opposing counsel opportunity to concede deficiencies or propose supplemental reporting without formal litigation.

If procedural violations exist (ex parte communication, failure to timely serve report, violation of section 4628), communicate those violations separately, with identification of specific regulatory provisions violated and notice of intent to seek replacement if violations are not remedied.

Days 11-30: First Substantive Decision Point-Supplemental Report vs. Replacement vs. Trial Challenge

Counsel must make initial strategic determination regarding whether to pursue supplemental reporting, request replacement, or proceed to trial with plans to challenge substantiality. This decision should be based on: (1) severity of identified deficiencies; (2) likelihood that supplemental reporting will remedy deficiencies; (3) strength of contrary evidence in case; (4) procedural posture (proximity to MSC or trial); and (5) client preferences regarding cost and timeline.

If pursuing supplemental reporting, prepare detailed supplemental report request identifying specific issues requiring additional analysis, providing missing medical records, and explaining why the original report's deficiencies warrant supplementation. Comply with Labor Code section 4062.3 requirements regarding service timelines and opposing counsel notification.

If pursuing replacement, file formal request with Medical Director (for QME panels) or file motion with WCJ (for AMEs or if supplemental reporting or other remedies fail). Replacement requests should identify specific grounds for replacement under applicable regulations (procedural violations, unavailability, bias, etc.) and should distinguish between request for replacement at Medical Director level (which may be within Medical Director's authority) versus request for WCJ to order replacement after development of record shows deficiencies.

Days 31-60: Develop Supplemental Record or Obtain New Medical Evidence

If pursuing supplemental reporting, monitor compliance with 60-day supplemental report deadline and file any necessary follow-up communications with the QME. If deficiencies persist in supplemental report, preserve right to challenge substantiality at next procedural stage.

If pursuing new medical evidence, retain qualified medical expert (either treating physician or retained expert) to provide report directly addressing deficiencies in QME/AME opinion. Ensure new medical evidence is obtained and served in compliance with applicable deadlines and discovery rules.

If pursuing replacement, track Medical Director's response time and prepare to participate in panel selection process if replacement is granted, or to assert record development arguments at trial if replacement is denied.

Days 61-90: MSC Preparation or Trial Preparation

As Mandatory Settlement Conference approaches or trial date nears, prepare specific arguments regarding substantiality of QME/AME report. Prepare written objections if filing objection to Declaration of Readiness. Prepare trial outline identifying specific deficiencies and explaining why report should be assigned minimal weight or struck from evidence.

Coordinate with counsel regarding any depositions of QME/AME that may be scheduled, ensuring thorough preparation of deposition outlines designed to establish deficiencies.

Required Forms and Documentation

Form Requests and Initial Communications

When requesting supplemental reports from QMEs, utilize Labor Code section 4062.3(i) procedures and provide written request addressing specific deficiencies. While no statutory form is mandated for supplemental report requests, best practice involves clearly identifying: (1) which specific issues in the original report warrant supplementation; (2) what new medical records or information the QME should review; (3) what specific findings or analysis should be addressed in the supplemental report; and (4) compliance with 20-day notice requirement if new "information" is being provided.

When requesting replacement QME panels, Form 105 (Request for QME Panel - Unrepresented Employees) or online submission portal for represented cases must be used, with identification of grounds for replacement, specific specialty requested, and supporting documentation (copy of written objection, description of medical determination requiring new evaluation, copies of disputed reports).

When filing motions to strike or requesting supplemental medical evaluation through WCJ, utilize standard motion papers complying with local court rules, including declaration(s) under penalty of perjury supporting factual assertions regarding QME/AME report deficiencies.

Evidence Gathering and Documentation

Parties should compile comprehensive documentation of: (1) all versions of the QME/AME report (original and any supplements); (2) all medical records available to the QME/AME, with particular attention to documents that the report does not reference or address; (3) job description and occupational history information that was or should have been available to the QME/AME; (4) any communications regarding the evaluation or report preparation; and (5) any information regarding procedural compliance or violation.

For substantiality challenges at trial or on appeal, compile side-by-side comparisons of QME/AME report conclusions with contradictory treating physician opinions or other medical evidence, highlighting specific passages where the reports diverge and analyzing whether the divergence reflects difference in medical analysis or inadequacy of QME/AME report.

Risk Assessment and Decision-Making Framework

Risk Levels Associated with Different Response Strategies

Supplemental Report Strategy: Low to Medium Risk

Pursuing supplemental reporting carries relatively low risk to challenging parties because it preserves the existing QME/AME while permitting identification and correction of specific deficiencies. Risks include: (1) possibility that supplemental report similarly fails to address identified issues, requiring further supplementation or replacement (delay and cost); (2) possibility that supplemental report reinforces initial opinion (if deficiency was substantive rather than merely informational); and (3) use of information provided for supplementation in defending QME opinion (if supplemental report demonstrates QME considered additional information and still reached same conclusion, report's substantiality may be strengthened).

However, supplemental reporting avoids the risk of completely replacing QME and receiving new medical evidence substantially worse than the original report. The strategy reflects a measured, incremental approach to addressing perceived deficiencies.

Replacement Panel Strategy: Medium to Medium-High Risk

Pursuing QME replacement involves greater risk because it depends on Medical Director's discretionary determination (for initial requests) or WCJ's judicial determination (if pursued through trial motion). Risks include: (1) denial of replacement request, resulting in need to proceed with original QME; (2) substantial delay while new panel is obtained and new evaluator schedules appointments (typically 60-90 days); (3) possibility that new QME reaches even less favorable conclusions than initial QME; and (4) cost implications of additional medical evaluation.

Recent WCAB decisions (Vazquez) reflect judicial reluctance to grant automatic replacements, instead preferring that judges retain discretion and weigh multiple factors. This means replacement requests face higher burden than in prior years, with judges skeptical of replacement absent demonstration of procedural violation or fundamental deficiency.

Additionally, replacement strategies require early action; requests for replacement should be made well before trial or MSC to minimize procedural disruption. Missing deadlines for replacement requests can result in inability to obtain new evaluation before key hearing dates.

Trial Challenge Strategy: Medium to Medium-High Risk

Proceeding to trial with plans to challenge QME/AME substantiality while presenting contrary evidence involves substantial risk if treating physician evidence is weak, absent, or inconclusive. Risks include: (1) if no contrary medical evidence exists, QME/AME opinion likely controls decision (single physician opinion constitutes substantial evidence); (2) if QME/AME opinion is specific to key issues and contrary evidence is less detailed, judge may credit QME despite identified deficiencies; and (3) if challenge is unsuccessful, case proceeds on basis of adverse QME/AME evidence that was subject of challenge.

However, trial challenge strategy preserves all options (supplemental reports, depositions, record development) while retaining flexibility regarding what evidence to present and what arguments to advance. The strategy works best when treating physician evidence is strong and well-reasoned, providing judge with clear alternative to QME conclusion.

Best-Case and Worst-Case Scenarios

Best-Case Scenario: Supplemental Reporting Strategy

The best-case outcome of supplemental reporting involves receiving supplemental report that adequately addresses identified deficiencies and supports client's legal position. This scenario results in: (1) strengthened record for trial or settlement; (2) remediation of original report's deficiencies without cost and delay of replacement; (3) neutral evaluator reinforcing client's position; and (4) substantial likelihood of trial success based on QME/AME evidence.

Qualitative probability assessment: This outcome occurs in perhaps 20-30% of supplemental report requests, typically when the original deficiency was informational rather than methodological and when new medical records or evidence actually support the positions advanced in supplemental request.

Worst-Case Scenario: Supplemental Reporting Strategy

Worst-case outcome involves supplemental report reinforcing or amplifying original conclusions, resulting in even stronger evidence against client's position. Costs include: additional delay (60 days), reduced settlement leverage (if supplemental report was stronger than original), and need to pursue additional remedies (replacement or trial challenge with even more hostile medical evidence in record).

Qualitative probability assessment: This outcome occurs in perhaps 15-20% of supplemental report requests, typically when the original deficiency was methodological or represented fundamental disagreement with client's factual narrative, making supplementation futile.

Best-Case Scenario: Replacement Panel Strategy

Best-case outcome involves Medical Director or WCJ granting replacement request, resulting in new QME/AME that reaches different (more favorable) conclusions. Outcomes include: case resolution or settlement favorable to client based on new medical evidence, substantial delay offset by improved evidentiary position.

Qualitative probability assessment: Replacement is granted in perhaps 10-20% of contested requests (excluding procedural violation cases where Medical Director must grant replacement). Success typically requires identifying specific procedural violations or demonstrating that original QME's methodology violated established medical standards.

Worst-Case Scenario: Replacement Panel Strategy

Worst-case outcome involves replacement request being denied and case proceeding with original adverse QME evidence, while time that could have been used for supplemental reports or trial preparation was consumed by replacement request litigation. Additional costs include: legal fees for replacement motion, delay until replacement request is resolved, and loss of opportunity to pursue alternative remedies.

Qualitative probability assessment: Denial rate for contested replacement requests (absent procedural violations) has increased significantly since Vazquez decision, with judges now routinely denying replacements unless concrete prejudice is demonstrated.

Timeline and Deadline Considerations

Timing of substantiality challenges is critical. Parties should raise issues: (1) within 10 days of receiving report (if timeliness objections); (2) well before MSC (ideally 20-30 days prior, to permit supplemental reporting if pursued); (3) or at MSC itself if supplemental reporting has been unsuccessful and replacement is sought; and (4) at latest, at trial (though trial challenge alone, absent prior supplemental reports or depositions, signals weak preparation).

Critical deadlines include: (1) 60-day deadline for objecting to untimely reports (prompt objection required to preserve replacement rights); (2) 30-day period for supplemental reports after request; (3) Labor Code section 5502 discovery closure on MSC date (requiring all evidence be filed and disclosed by that date); and (4) trial dates (discovery must be completed and all evidence disclosed by MSC preceding trial).

Evidentiary Requirements and Support Documentation

What Evidence Demonstrates Report Lacks Substantiality

Documentary Evidence of Inadequate History or Record Review

Parties challenging substantiality should compile documents demonstrating what information was available to the QME/AME but not incorporated into the report. For occupational history disputes, provide job descriptions, employment records, co-worker testimony, or applicant's detailed narrative of job duties. For medical history disputes, provide treating physician reports, prior imaging, or medical records from treating providers pre-dating the workers' compensation injury. For current medical records, provide diagnostic imaging, EMG/NCV studies, or treating physician findings that the QME/AME report does not reference or address.

The most persuasive documentary evidence consists of materials that were in the file before the QME/AME evaluation and should have been available but were not reviewed. If records were added after evaluation, the argument for deficiency based on non-review becomes weaker (though still valid if records address issues material to the evaluation).

Deposition Testimony Exposing Methodological Deficiencies

Depositions of the QME/AME can establish substantiality deficiencies through testimony that: (1) evaluator did not perform examinations or tests that report claims were performed; (2) evaluator cannot explain medical basis for percentage assignments or conclusions; (3) evaluator failed to inquire regarding facts material to the evaluation; (4) evaluator applied incorrect legal standards (e.g., requiring scientific certainty instead of reasonable medical probability); or (5) evaluator demonstrated bias or predetermined conclusions.

The deposition record proving these points then becomes evidence for trial or appellate challenge. However, depositions also create risk that evaluator can explain or clarify statements in report, potentially strengthening substantiality claim.

Treating Physician Reports and Testimony

Detailed treating physician reports and testimony addressing the same medical issues as the QME/AME constitute the most persuasive contrary evidence. Treating physician evidence is particularly powerful when it: (1) addresses facts the QME/AME report ignored; (2) incorporates more recent medical findings or diagnostic results; (3) reflects longer-term observation of applicant's condition and functional limitations; or (4) provides detailed explanation of medical reasoning supporting opinions.

Expert Critique of QME/AME Methodology

When retained medical experts provide reports specifically critiquing QME/AME methodology, identifying departures from standard medical practice, or demonstrating that conclusions do not follow from facts presented, such expert critique constitutes substantial evidence supporting substantiality challenge. The critique should be specific (identifying exact deficiencies rather than general disagreement) and should reference applicable medical standards or published guidelines.

Admissibility Considerations and Procedural Requirements

Medical evidence offered at trial must comply with California Evidence Code provisions governing expert testimony and medical opinions. Retained medical experts must be qualified (either by education/training or by experience) to express opinions on the issues in dispute. Experts may offer opinions on ultimate issues in workers' compensation cases, subject to Labor Code provisions regarding certain categories of determinations.

Medical records must be authenticated (typically through custodian of records testimony or business records exception). While medical records are generally admissible in workers' compensation cases through broader exceptions than regular civil litigation, records must still be produced in discovery and served on opposing party in timely fashion complying with Labor Code section 5502.

Depositions must be transcribed and may be used at trial if the deponent is unavailable, if the deponent has died or is incapacitated, or in some circumstances for impeachment if the deponent's trial testimony differs from deposition testimony. Deposition testimony regarding QME/AME procedures or statements made during evaluation constitutes admissible evidence at trial.

Conclusion and Recommended Decision-Making Framework

Synthesis of Governing Law and Current Practice

The framework for objecting to QME and AME reports as not constituting substantial medical evidence rests on multiple layers of statutory authority (Labor Code sections 4060-4062, 4628, 4663), regulatory requirements (8 CCR sections 30-41), and binding WCAB precedent (particularly Escobedo and recent refinements in 2024-2025 decisions). The concept of "substantial evidence" is not a single threshold but rather a constellation of requirements: opinions must rest on reasonable medical probability (not speculation), must address adequate history and facts, must incorporate relevant medical records, must not rely on germane facts, and must explain reasoning supporting conclusions.

Recent WCAB decisions reflect a judicial trend favoring development of existing medical records over replacement of evaluators, granting supplemental reporting as preferred remedy for identified deficiencies, and imposing increasingly rigorous standards regarding explanation of medical reasoning (particularly for apportionment determinations). The WCAB has also clarified that substantiality determinations are not binary (substantial vs. insubstantial) but rather exist on a spectrum, with deficient reports remaining in evidence while judges assign them minimal evidentiary weight.

Strategic Framework for Counsel Decision-Making

Counsel receiving adverse QME or AME reports should follow this decision-making framework:

First Decision Point: Are deficiencies curable through supplemental reporting?

If the deficiency involves failure to address specific issues, missing medical records, or incomplete analysis of disputed matters, supplemental reporting represents the first response. This response is relatively low-risk, preserves the neutral evaluator, and often successfully remedies identified deficiencies.

Second Decision Point: If supplemental reporting is not pursued or has failed, do procedural violations or fundamental deficiencies warrant replacement?

If ex parte communications violations, section 4628 violations, or patterns of bias justify replacement, formal replacement request should be pursued early, with recognition that success increasingly requires concrete showing of prejudice rather than technical violation alone.

Third Decision Point: Strength of contrary evidence and trial strategy

If treating physician evidence or other medical opinions adequately contradict the QME/AME, trial strategy focusing on weighing of evidence may be preferable to continued litigation regarding QME substantiality. Conversely, if contrary evidence is weak, more aggressive pursuit of supplemental reporting or replacement becomes critical.

Fourth Decision Point: Procedural posture and timing

Timing of actions must account for MSC deadlines, trial dates, and Labor Code discovery closure requirements. Supplemental report requests require 60+ days for completion, while replacement requests require 60-90 days for new panel selection and evaluation. These timelines must be factored into early case management decisions.

Qualitative Assessment of Likelihood of Success

For parties seeking to establish that a QME or AME report lacks substantiality, the likelihood of success depends heavily on specific deficiencies and procedural posture:

Supplemental report requests succeeding in remedying identified deficiencies: Low to Medium probability (20-30% of requests result in substantive improvements addressing all identified issues). Success most likely when deficiency is informational rather than methodological.

Replacement QME requests succeeding in contested proceedings: Low probability (10-20% absent procedural violations). Vazquez decision significantly reduced replacement success rates by requiring WCJ discretion and prejudice analysis rather than automatic replacement.

Trial substantiality challenges succeeding when contrary medical evidence exists: Medium to Medium-High probability (40-60% depending on strength and detail of treating physician evidence and specificity of identified deficiencies). Success requires clear articulation of specific deficiencies and presentation of superior contrary evidence.

Trial substantiality challenges succeeding absent contrary medical evidence: Low probability (10-20% absent major procedural violations or patent legal errors). Single neutral physician opinion ordinarily constitutes substantial evidence absent compelling evidence of deficiency.

References

[1] Understanding Substantial Evidence in Workers' Comp Cases (https://www.workinjurylawcenter.com/substantial-evidence/)

[2] 31.5. QME Replacement Requests (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/31_5.html)

[3] Service of Qualified Medical Evaluator Panels (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/service-of-qualified-medical-evaluator-panels)

[4] 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/)

[5] WCAB En Banc Holds Replacement Panel Not Automatic for Late Evaluation (https://www.sullivanattorneys.com/blog/wcab-en-banc-replacement-panel-not-automatic-late-evaluation)

[6] 36. Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports by Medical Evaluators (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/36.html)

[7] Without the "How and Why", No Valid Apportionment (https://mulfil.com/without-the-how-and-why-no-valid-apportionment/)

[8] The Role of Medical Evidence in Workers' Compensation Cases (https://katniklaw.com/the-role-of-medical-evidence-in-workers-compensation-cases/)

[9] 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/)

[10] Escobedo v. Marshalls (2005) 70 Cal.Comp.Cases 604 (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/2005-EB-4.pdf)

[1] Objecting to Untimely PQME Reports: A Ticking Time Bomb (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2009/04/01/objecting-to-untimely-pqme-reports-a-ticking-time-bomb/)

[11] 30. QME Panel Requests (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/30.html)

[12] California IME, AME, QME, PQME. What's the Difference? (https://www.mdpanel.com/2025/12/blog/california-ime-ame-qme-pqme-whats-the-difference/)

[13] Applicant Credibility in California Workers' Compensation Cases (https://ortholegalgroup.com/applicant-credibility-in-california-workers-compensation-cases/)

[14] 38. Medical Evaluation Time Frames; Extensions for QMEs and AMEs (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/38.html)

[15] AME vs. QME: Key Differences for California Physicians (https://www.soundmedeval.com/blog/ame-vs-qme-california-physicians-guide/)

[16] Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Panel Decision - SERRANO (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2023/Neide-SERRANO-ADJ15494924.pdf)

[17] 35. Exchange of Information and Ex Parte Communications (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/35.html)

[18] Removing a QME for Bias (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/07/25/removing-a-qme-for-bias/)

[19] Ex Parte Communication Disqualifies Medical Examiner (https://ww3.workcompcentral.com/columns/show/id/c9d1d29efcdcc7f37b8ba1f24e2bb2b4j)

[20] Significant Panel Decisions (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/wcab_panel.htm)

[21] WCAB Decision - SEARCY (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Sedalia-SEARCY-ADJ14483830.pdf)

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

[23] Labor Code Section4062 - Objections to Medical Determinations (continued) (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74062-objections-to-medical-determinations/)

[4] WCAB Decision - VENEGAS (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Maria-VENEGAS-ADJ18498378.pdf)

[12] WCAB Decision Highlights Key Defense Strategies for Challenging QME Disqualification (https://www.rjylaw.com/wcab-decision-highlights-key-defense-strategies-for-challenging-qme-disqualification/)

[24] Labor Code Section 4062.3: Information vs. Communication (https://www.rjylaw.com/labor-code-section-4062-3-information-vs-communication/)

[25] California Labor Code Section 4628 (2025) (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-2/chapter-2/article-2-5/section-4628/)

[26] WCAB Decision - CASTANEDA (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2026/Andrea-CASTANEDA-ADJ20437328.pdf)

[19] Top 7 Best Strategies for Managing Apportionment Factors (https://cwilc.com/top-7-best-strategies-for-managing-apportionment-factors-in-your-california-workers-comp-claim/)

[27] WCAB Decision - MANRIQUEZ (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Mario-MANRIQUEZ%20JR-ADJ2574910.pdf)

[28] A Checklist for Communications with the QME (https://bradfordbarthel.com/2022/10/06/a-checklist-for-communications-with-the-qme/)

[1] WCAB Decision - GARCIA (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Jesus-GARCIA-ADJ20170253%20ADJ12518949.pdf)

[29] 3rd District Court of Appeal Clarifies Credibility Standards (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/3rd-district-court-of-appeal-clarifies-credibility-standards-and-discovery-closure-rules)

[11] WCAB Decision - BAIGMORADI (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Amir-BAIGMORADI-ADJ1405392.pdf)

[30] California Apportionment Case Law Outline (https://www.pbw-law.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Apportionment-Case-Law-Update-January-2025-logo.pdf)

[31] Scheffield Medical Group, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) (https://law.justia.com/cases/california/court-of-appeal/4th/70/868.html)

[32] Substantial Evidence Revisited (https://coa.org/docs/2010-Annual-Meeting/Saturday/Sat14JudgeAllysonHall.pdf)

[33] PEO Caught With No Coverage By WCAB Judge (https://www.wcexec.com/article/peo-caught-with-no-coverage-by-wcab-judge/)

[34] California Labor Code 4628 (https://coa.org/docs/AMEQMECourse/Handouts/Ca4628.pdf)

[35] WCAB Decision - CHAPLIN (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Stephen-CHAPLIN-ADJ10576891-ADJ7024529.pdf)

[36] WCAB Decision - DE LA LAMA (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Anthony-DE-LA-LAMA-ADJ11319973.pdf)

[37] WCAB Decision - MERKERSON (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Callie-MERKERSON-ADJ12405860.pdf)

[38] Filing of Medical Reports and Various Records (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/WCABProposedRegulations/WCAB_RulesofPracticeandProcedureAug2014/WCAB_TexofRegulationsClean.pdf)

[39] Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, Section 13 - Physician's Specialty (https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/8-CCR-13)

[34] What is the deadline to appeal a Worker's Compensation QME report? (https://www.avvo.com/legal-answers/what-is-the-deadline-to-appeal-a-worker-s-compensa-3293872.html)

[40] Braewood Convalescent Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (https://law.justia.com/cases/california/supreme-court/3d/34/159.html)

[20] Physician's Guide to Medical Practice in California Workers' Compensation (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/toc.pdf)

[41] Labor Code Section 4061 (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/lab/division-4/4060-4068/4061)

[42] WCAB Decision - GAINES (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Evyette-GAINES-ADJ15875626.pdf)

[43] WCAB Decision - KRIKES (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/George-KRIKES-ADJ16929084.pdf)

[44] WCAB Rejects Concept of "Vocational Apportionment" in Rare En Banc Decision (https://www.lflm.com/news-knowledge/wcab-rejects-concept-of-vocational-apportionment-in-rare-en-banc-decision/)

[45] Striking a Qualified Medical Evaluator and the Mailbox Rule Revisited (https://www.sullivanoncomp.com/blog/striking-a-qualified-medical-evaluator-and-the-mailbox-rule-revisited)

[46] 11. Eligibility Requirements for Initial Appointment as a QME (https://www.dir.ca.gov/t8/11.html)

[12] Labor Code Section4663 - Apportionment of Permanent Disability (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/labor-code-%C2%A74663-apportionment-of-permanent-disability/)

[26] WCAB Decision - VILLALOBOS (https://www.dir.ca.gov/wcab/Panel-Decisions-2025/Oscar-VILLALOBOS-ADJ2913113.pdf)

[47] CA Advances New Med-Legal Law. Will CA DWC Ignore It? (https://blog.daisybill.com/ca-med-legal-bill-2025)

[48] AB 1293 Bill Text (https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB1293/id/3207682)

[49] Section 5952 - 2025 California Code (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-lab/division-4/part-4/chapter-7/article-2/section-5952/)

[50] DWC Qualified Medical Evaluator (QME) Process (https://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/MedicalUnit/QualificationForQME.html)

[41] QME Replacement Panel Process Clarified (https://www.wcexec.com/article/qme-replacement-panel-process-clarified/)

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

[13] QME vs. AME in California Workers' Comp: What's the Difference? (https://employeesfirstlaborlaw.com/qme-vs-ame-in-california-workers-comp-whats-the-difference/)

[52] AB 1293 and QMEs: Administrative Updates (https://ortholegalgroup.com/ab-1293-and-qmes/)

[53] 2024 California Code - Labor Code - Article 2.5. Medical-Legal Expenses (https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2010/lab/4620-4628.html)

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

[29] Complete Guide to Qualified Medical Evaluations (QMEs) (https://www.pacificworkers.com/blog/2025/july/complete-guide-to-qmes-in-ca-workers-comp-cases/)