

Case Number:	CM14-0191929		
Date Assigned:	11/25/2014	Date of Injury:	03/12/1970
Decision Date:	01/12/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/13/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/17/2014

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 Family Practice 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 expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records: The 81 year old male claimant sustained a work injury on 3/12/70 resulting in a severe traumatic brain injury. He had undergone a craniotomy and developed left spastic hemiparesis, left hemianopsia and left hemisensory loss. Due to immobility he had developed osteoporosis. A progress note on 9/3/14 indicated the claimant had limited mobility. He was using a metal AFO boot. Exam findings were unremarkable. The physician requested 2 pairs of shoes with articulated with Articulated AFO with dorsi assist and plantar flexion block due to a left foot drop.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

2 Pairs of shoes with articulated metallic ankle foot orthosis (AFO): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 370.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines, orthoses are appropriate for various knee and foot related problems. The claimant had a foot drop and difficulty with mobility requiring shoes

with AFO. However, there is no indication that 2 pairs are necessary for replacement. The progress note also does not mention what is specifically wrong with the current pair. The request for 2 pairs of shoes with AFO is not medically necessary.