

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM14-0020663 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 04/30/2014   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 06/18/2013 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 07/08/2014   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 01/24/2014 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 02/19/2014 |

### 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:

The claimant, a 65-year-old gentleman, on 06/18/2013 sustained a fracture of the ankle. The medical records provided for review document a bimalleolar fracture that required open reduction and internal fixation on the date of injury. The postoperative report of 01/17/14 noted the claimant to have continued complaints of pain in the ankle for which and that a recent CT scan showed findings consistent with malunion of the prior fracture. Based on failed conservative care and current the documented imaging findings, a revision procedure to include revision open reduction internal fixation of malunion was recommended. This request is for Deep Venous Thrombosis (DVT) prophylactics and pneumatic compression wrap.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

#### **PNEUMATIC COMPRESSION WRAPS - PURCHASE FOR LEFT ANKLE:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, ODG-TWC Ankle & Foot Procedure Summary last updated 12/19/2013.

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

**Decision rationale:** Based on the California ACOEM Guidelines and supported by the Official Disability Guidelines, the request for purchase of pneumatic compression wraps for the left ankle following the claimant's upcoming surgery would be supported. This is a 65-year-old gentleman who is undergoing a revision procedure for fracture fixation which will require a prolonged, non-weight bearing course. The use of compressive wraps would be indicated in light of the claimant's age and an increased risk for a venous thrombotic event in the setting of the requested revision fracture fixation surgery. Therefore, the request for pneumatic compression wraps purchase for left ankle is medically necessary and appropriate.

**DVT PROPHYLAXIS FOR LEFT ANKLE:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, ODG-TWC Ankle & Foot Procedure Summary last updated 12/19/2013.

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

**Decision rationale:** Based on Official Disability Guidelines criteria, as the California MTUS and ACOEM Guidelines do not address DVT prophylaxis, the request for this supportive measure following the claimant's upcoming surgery would be supported. This is a 65-year-old gentleman who is undergoing a revision procedure for fracture fixation which will require a prolonged, non-weight bearing course. The use of Deep Venous Thrombosis (DVT) prophylactics would be indicated given this 65-year-old gentleman's increase risk for a venous thrombotic event in the setting of the requested revision fracture fixation surgery. Therefore, the request for Deep Venous Thrombosis (DVT) prophylaxis for left ankle is medically necessary and appropriate.