

Case Number:	CM14-0046875		
Date Assigned:	07/02/2014	Date of Injury:	10/03/2013
Decision Date:	08/01/2014	UR Denial Date:	03/24/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/14/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Management 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:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 10/3/13. A utilization review determination dated 3/24/14 recommends non-certification of an FCE. The 4/9/14 report identifies that the patient continues to have pain in the right ankle s/p ORIF bimalleolar fracture dislocation and is a candidate for FCE for more information as to the patient's physical abilities and a decision on patient's work disability. The 2/21/14 medical report identifies that the patient is doing well and the wound has healed approximately 50% since his last evaluation. He is on oral antibiotics. No abnormal exam findings are noted. FCE was recommended to determine an accurate impairment rating.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One Functional capacity evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM (American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine) Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Official Disability Guidelines (ODG)- Chapter: Fitness for Duty.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 1 Prevention Page(s): 12. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Fitness for Duty Chapter, Functional Capacity Evaluation.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for functional capacity evaluation, California MTUS and ACOEM state that there is not good evidence that functional capacity evaluations are correlated with a lower frequency of health complaints or injuries. ODG states that functional capacity evaluations are recommended prior to admission to a work hardening program. The criteria for the use of a functional capacity evaluation includes case management being hampered by complex issues such as prior unsuccessful return to work attempts, conflicting medical reporting on precautions and/or fitness for modified job, or injuries that require detailed explanation of a worker's abilities. Additionally, guidelines recommend that the patient be close to or at maximum medical improvement with all key medical reports secured and additional/secondary conditions clarified. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that there has been prior unsuccessful return to work attempts, conflicting medical reporting, or injuries that would require detailed exploration. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested functional capacity evaluation is not medically necessary.