

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0063842		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/30/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/17/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/14/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	12/04/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/10/2013

### 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 Orthopedic Surgery 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 claimant is a 60 year old male sustained an injury to the left foot on August 17, 2012. The mechanism of injury was not documented. The limited clinical records for review identified a recent assessment on September 5, 2013 for continued left foot pain with tenderness noted over the first metatarsal-cuneiform joint noted. The claimant was diagnosed with a neuroma. The medical records did not document physical examination findings, prior treatment or previous imaging studies.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Partial bone excision of the first metatarsal-cuneiform joint in the left foot:** 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.

**Decision rationale:** Based on the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 14 Guidelines, the surgical request for partial bone excision of the first metatarsal-cuneiform joint in the left foot cannot be recommended as medically necessary. According to the American College of Occupational and Environmental

Medicine Guidelines, surgery is only indicated regarding the foot and ankle when there is failure to demonstrate functional improvement with clear clinical evidence on imaging of a lesion that has been shown to benefit in the short and long term from surgery. The current records fail to demonstrate imaging in regards to the claimant's foot to support the need of operative procedure. There is also limited documentation of physical examination findings and no documentation of conservative treatment offered and failed. Therefore, the medical records absent the above information failed to support the requested surgery.