

Case Number:	CM13-0047783		
Date Assigned:	06/09/2014	Date of Injury:	04/12/2010
Decision Date:	07/14/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/26/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/04/2013

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 Internal 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 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 injured worker is a 74-year-old male who sustained injury to his right foot on 04/12/10. The mechanism of injury was not documented. MRI of the right foot revealed a healing fracture of the first metatarsal shaft; mild bone marrow edema at the base of the second metatarsal and findings of osteoarthritis at the first metatarsophalangeal joint. Records indicate that the injured worker has had an extensive amount of physical therapy visits, but there was no information provided that would indicate the exact amount of visits the injured worker has completed to date.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

PHYSICAL THERAPY EIGHT VISITS, TWO TIMES PER WEEK FOR FOUR WEEKS: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: The request for physical therapy times eight visits two times per week times four weeks is not medically necessary. The previous request was denied on the basis that the injured worker has had multiple physical therapy visits to date and the submitted notes give very little information objectively as to any objective improvement and/or any continued deficits to

support additional physical therapy visits. Additionally, it cannot be determined how much physical therapy the patient had or not had. The CAMTUS recommends up to 12 visits over 12 weeks for the diagnosed injury, not to exceed 6 months. There was no indication that the injured worker is actively participating in a home exercise program. There was no additional significant objective clinical information provided that would support the need to exceed the CAMTUS recommendations, either in frequency or duration of physical therapy visits. Given the clinical documentation submitted for review, medical necessity of the request for physical therapy times eight visits two times per week times four weeks has not been established.

FOLLOW UP WITH SURGEON: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Ankle and foot chapter, Office visits.

Decision rationale: The request for follow up with surgeon is not medically necessary. The previous request was denied on the basis that the referral was made for surgery of hammertoe, but there was no indication of hammertoe in the submitted documentation to support the referral. After reviewing the submitted documentation, there was no additional information provided that would support reversing the previous adverse determination. Given the clinical documentation submitted for review, medical necessity of the request for follow up with surgeon has not been established.