

Case Number:	CM13-0015229		
Date Assigned:	03/10/2014	Date of Injury:	07/29/1998
Decision Date:	05/21/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/05/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/22/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Podiatry, and is licensed to practice in California. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The patient is a 40-year-old male who reported an injury on 07/29/1998. The mechanism of injury was not provided for review. The patient's most recent clinical examination findings were dated 02/22/2013. It was documented that the patient had increasing locking and catching of his left ankle. It was noted that the patient had received x-rays of the bilateral feet and ankles that revealed no increased calcifications of the soft tissues. The patient's chronic pain was treated with medications. A request was made for an X-ray of the left ankle and foot.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

X-RAY OF THE LEFT ANKLE AND FOOT AS AN OUTPATIENT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 372-374.

Decision rationale: The American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine recommends that additional imaging studies may be needed to assist in clarifying the diagnosis of unexplained physical findings upon examination to assist with treatment planning. However, there was no recent clinical documentation to support the request. Therefore, the appropriateness

of the request cannot be determined. As such, the requested x-ray of the left ankle and foot as an outpatient is not medically necessary or appropriate.