

Case Number:	CM14-0167538		
Date Assigned:	10/14/2014	Date of Injury:	09/07/1999
Decision Date:	11/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/03/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/10/2014

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 Podiatric Surgery and is licensed to practice in New York. 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:

According to the enclosed information the original date of injury for this patient is 9-7-1999. It is noted in the enclosed information that this patient received a foot injection by their podiatrist on 9-23-2014. The primary diagnosis listed is 735.2 hallux limitus. Other treating diagnoses include; diabetes, osteoarthritis ankle and foot, exostosis, synovitis and tenosynovitis.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Injection given on 9-23-2014: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Trigger Point Injections.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 371..

Decision rationale: After careful review of the enclosed information and the pertinent medical criteria for this case, it is my opinion that the injection given on 9-23-2014 was not medically reasonable or necessary according to the criteria. The ACOEM and MTUS guidelines state that Invasive techniques (e.g., needle acupuncture and injection procedures) have no proven value, with the exception of corticosteroid injection into the affected web space in patients with Morton's neuroma or into the affected area in patients with plantar fasciitis or heel spur if four to

six weeks of conservative therapy is ineffective. This patient has neither of these diagnoses and therefore does not meet the criteria.