

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0044751		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/27/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/16/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/11/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/11/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/01/2013

### 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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in pain Medicine 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 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 48 years old and has injuries to multiple body parts arising out of employment on 2/16/09. At this time we are simply reviewing the request for an ankle MRI. He has had two ankle MRIs but these appear to be before his ankle surgery and there is no known MRI after the ankle surgery. The utilization review report states that "authorization has been requested for MRI imaging of all affected body parts." On the utilization review report the ankle MRI has been denied because there was no exam of the ankle, or red flag that would warrant approval. The chart noted dated 9/10/2013 states that the MRI is being done to evaluate healing of the soft tissue lateral collateral complex. Physical exam findings are not documented with that request. The patient underwent ankle surgery on August 27, 2009. He had a subsequent surgery on September 7, 2011. The exam of August 12, 2013 only reveals hypersensitivity and an antalgic gait. This was an AME report and did not mention any need for an MRI of the ankle.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI w/out Contrast, right ankle:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines; Section: Ankle & Foot (Acute & Chronic)(Updated 8-19-2013).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) ANKLE & FOOT, Acute & Chronic and Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Occupational medical practice guidelines pages 361-374 with page 374 discussing imaging.

**Decision rationale:** The notes were reviewed and at this time based on a lack of physical exam with the request for an MRI, the previous notes imply only a soft tissue origin. Guidelines on page 374 of the occupational medicine practice guidelines state that an MRI is not medically necessary in this case. Furthermore, there would have to be a complete rationale which correlated to a physical exam finding and would explain the rationale as to why obtaining an MRI would change future treatment.