

Case Number:	CM14-0000125		
Date Assigned:	01/17/2014	Date of Injury:	07/29/2013
Decision Date:	12/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/24/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/01/2014

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 Family Practice 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:

53 yr. female old claimant sustained a work injury on 7/29/13 involving the left ankle. She was diagnosed with a left ankle strain. A progress note on 10/22/13 indicated the claimant had 3/10 ankle pain. Exam findings were notable for edema in the left lateral malleolus. There was pain in plantar flexion, inversion and eversion. She had undergone physical therapy. A progress note on 12/13/13 indicated the claimant had an antalgic gait. An MRI of the left ankle was requested to evaluate for ligament injury.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI PLAIN LEFT ANKLE: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 376.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines, additional evaluation is recommended if there is an x-ray finding of >13 mm of ankle effusion. X-rays are recommended in acute injuries for those that meet the Ottawa criteria. The claimant's injury was not acute. There was no evidence

of 13 mm of effusion on x-ray. A recent x-ray report was not provided. There was no plan for surgery. The request for an MRI is not medically necessary.