

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0088404		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/23/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/13/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/18/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/27/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/12/2014

### 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 Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Management and is licensed to practice in Tennessee. 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 records made available for review, this is a 54-year-old male with a 5/13/12 date of injury. At the time (5/16/14) of the request for authorization for left leg venous reflux study and ABIs (ankle brachial index) with exercise, there is documentation of subjective (pain in his leg with intermittent slurring) and objective (moderate swelling in both lower extremities with some mild reversible varicosities) findings, current diagnoses (pain left leg and moderate swelling bilateral lower extremities following an injury two years ago), and treatment to date (medication). Regarding left leg venous reflux study, there is no documentation of a high risk of developing venous thrombosis.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Left leg venous reflux study:** 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) Knee & Leg, Venous thrombosis.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS does not address the issue. ODG identifies documentation of that the patient has a high risk of developing venous thrombosis to support the medical necessity of the requested Duplex ultrasound/venous reflux study. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of pain left leg and moderate swelling bilateral lower extremities following an injury two years ago. However, there is no documentation of a high risk of developing venous thrombosis. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for left leg venous reflux study is not medically necessary.

**ABIs (ankle brachial index) with exercise:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Critical Review of the Ankle Brachial Index <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2779349/>.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS and ODG do not address the issue. Medical Treatment Guideline identifies the current evidence is insufficient to assess the balance of benefits and harms of screening for peripheral artery disease (PAD) and cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk assessment with the ankle-brachial index (ABI) in adults. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for ABIs with exercise is not medically necessary.