

Case Number:	CM14-0002628		
Date Assigned:	02/10/2014	Date of Injury:	03/31/2013
Decision Date:	06/23/2014	UR Denial Date:	01/02/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/07/2014

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 Occupational 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 patient is a 35-year-old male who has submitted a claim for back and bilateral knee pain, associated with an industrial injury date of March 31, 2013. Medical records from 2013 through 2014 were reviewed. The patient noted persistent back pain and bilateral knee pain. Physical examination revealed muscle spasm and hypomobility in the thoracic and lumbar spine with reduced range of motion. Knee tenderness was present with decreased range of motion. The type and nature of treatment rendered to the patient post-injury was not available for review. Utilization review from January 2, 2014 denied the request for podiatry consultation because a complete review of the past history is essential prior to certifying any additional treatment or diagnostic testing.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

PODIATRY CONSULTATION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation Page(s): 15.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) 9792.23, page(s) 127, 156

Decision rationale: According to pages 127, 156 of the CA MTUS, ACOEM guidelines, the occupational health practitioner may refer to other specialists if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work. In this case, a comprehensive history and physical exam were not discussed. The type and nature of previous treatment was not available for review. The subjective complaints as described do not show the severity of the condition or the complexity of the case. The medical necessity has not been established at this time. Therefore, the request for podiatry consultation is not medically necessary.