MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0130551		
Date Assigned:	07/17/2015	Date of Injury:	11/08/2012
Decision Date:	08/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/07/2015

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: California, Indiana, Oregon
Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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 injured worker is a 26 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/08/2012. On provider visit dated 06/12/2015 the injured worker has reported right ankle pain. On examination of the point of maximal tenderness over the anterior-medial aspect of the right ankle. Pain increased at the extreme of dorsiflexion, and was neurovascular intact. The diagnoses have included osteochondritis dissecans. Treatment to date has included injections. The provider recommended an arthroscopic debridement of the ankle joint, pain was noted to be likely from scarring within the ankle joint. The injured worker was noted to be working on modified duty. The provider requested right ankle arthroscopic debridement, post-operative knee scooter or wheelchair x8 weeks and Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right ankle arthroscopic debridement: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 374.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) ankle.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of ankle arthroscopy. Per the ODG Ankle and Foot criteria, ankle arthroscopy for ankle instability, septic arthritis, arthrofibrosis, and removal of loose bodies is supported with only poor-quality evidence. Except for arthrodesis, treatment of ankle arthritis, excluding isolated bony impingement, is not effective and therefore this indication is not recommended. Finally, there is insufficient evidence-based literature to support or refute the benefit of arthroscopy for the treatment of synovitis and fractures. In this case, there is no evidence in the cited records from 6/12/15 of significant pathology to warrant surgical care. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Post-operative physical therapy 2x3: 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) ankle.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Post-operative knee scooter or wheelchair x8 weeks: 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) ankle.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 80.

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 80, opioids should be continued if the patient has returned to work and the patient has improved functioning and pain. Based upon the records reviewed there is insufficient evidence to support chronic use of narcotics. There is lack of demonstrated functional improvement, percentage of relief, demonstration of urine toxicology compliance or increase in activity from the exam note of 6/12/15. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.