

Case Number:	CM14-0201967		
Date Assigned:	12/12/2014	Date of Injury:	08/02/2013
Decision Date:	01/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/03/2014

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 North Carolina. 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 had a date of injury of 8/2/2013. Diagnoses include traumatic ankle injury and ankle sprain/strain. Treatment plan included home exercise program, medication, acupuncture and orthopedic consultation. The request is for retro heat therapy unit.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retro heat therapy unit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Ankle & Foot, Heat Therapy

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 369.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS Section on chronic pain does not address the use of proprietary heat therapy systems. The ACOEM Chapter on Ankle and Foot recommends the use of cold packs in the first few days following injury, then recommends application of heat to provide relief from pain. There is no evidence to support the use of a heat therapy unit over an ordinary heat pack. Heat therapy system is not medically necessary and the original UR decision is upheld.

