

Case Number:	CM13-0034912		
Date Assigned:	12/11/2013	Date of Injury:	11/30/2012
Decision Date:	02/04/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/04/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/15/2013

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Internal Medicine, and is licensed to practice in Rhode Island. 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 physician 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 claimant is a 58 year old male who presents for a date of injury of 11/30/12. He has a plantar plate rupture documented by MRI on 2/8/13, as well as chronic pain in his foot. He has difficulty walking. His exam shows tenderness in plantar surface from insertion to phalanx on left foot.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the left foot: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 361-386. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines

Decision rationale: The claimant has a plantar plate rupture which is documented by one MRI. There appears to be no significant change in the clinical condition to warrant a second MRI; there is no new history of examination findings. It is also not clear that a full course of physical therapy has been completed as required by the guidelines. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.