

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0115945		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/04/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/01/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/10/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/27/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/24/2014

### 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 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:

██████████ is a 64-year-old gentleman injured in work-related accident 09/01/11. Clinical records indicate a foot injury. A progress report of 06/06/14 describes the claimant had recently been prescribed with custom foot orthotic braces which have been helpful. It states he is also being treated for cervical issues, right wrist tendinitis, lumbosacral radiculopathy, and right hip trochanteric bursitis. Since time of injury, he is status post multiple surgeries for the work-related injury including an inguinal hernia repair, five shoulder surgeries and a right carpal tunnel release. Physical examination findings at that date revealed equal and symmetrical reflexes with a symmetrical gait pattern. Due to the current diagnosis of recurrent and chronic sprain to the ankle, there was request for four compressive braces to be utilized. It seems that the claimant would wear two braces while the other two could be washed. There was also request for six rolls of tape in association with the bracing. There is no documentation of recent imaging for review.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

#### **4 Compression Braces: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines 11th edition Knee & Leg Chapter Footwear.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG)--Official Disability Guidelines Treatment in Worker's Comp , 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: ankle procedure Immobilization.

**Decision rationale:** California ACEOM Guidelines are silent. Regarding the use of protective bracing for the ankles, when looking at Official Disability Guidelines, request in this case would not be supported. In regards to immobilization, guidelines indicate that early mobilization for functional injuries in association with weightbearing restrictions can provide favorable treatment strategy for ankle sprains in the acute setting. There is no current indication, however, for immobilization of chronic ankle injuries as the chronic ongoing use of immobilization may lead to worsening conditions or weakness to the immobilized extremity. Given the claimant's current clinical diagnosis and time frame from injury, there is no current direct clinical indication for the use of bracing or structural support for the ankles. The specific request in this case would not be supported.

**6 Rolls of 2-inch tape:** 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)-- Official Disability Guidelines Treatment in Worker's Comp , 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: ankle procedure Immobilization.

**Decision rationale:** California ACEOM Guidelines are also silent. When looking at Official Disability Guidelines criteria, the use of tape for assistance in immobilization would not be indicated as the role of immobilization itself has not been supported.