

Case Number:	CM15-0136571		
Date Assigned:	07/24/2015	Date of Injury:	09/19/2012
Decision Date:	08/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/14/2015

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: Texas, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 45 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 09-19-2012. The injured worker reported bilateral heel pain. On provider visit dated 06-05-2015 the injured worker has reported bilateral heel-arch pain at 8-9/10 with radiation. On examination hypersensitivity was noted bilateral in lateral sural, sural, medial plantar, lateral plantar, medial calcaneal and lateral calcaneal. Pain with palpation with of bilateral calcaneal bodies and bilateral fascia bilateral sinus tarsi, peroneal tendon with bilateral ankle joints was noted and ankle joint dorsiflexion on both sides were noted as decreased. The patient has had negative Tinel sign and limited range of motion. The diagnoses have included plantar fasciitis, peroneal tendonitis, bursitis-unspecified, right ankle injury and pain. Treatment to date has included medication, cortisone injections, physical therapy, acupuncture and orthotics. The provider requested Unna's Boot to the bilateral feet. The patient had used a orthotics unit for this injury. Any diagnostic imaging report was not specified in the records provided.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Unna's Boot to the bilateral feet: 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.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 371.

Decision rationale: Request: Unna's Boot to the bilateral feet. Per the ACOEM guidelines cited below "Rigid orthotics (full-shoe-length inserts made to realign within the foot and from foot to leg) may reduce pain experienced during walking and may reduce more global measures of pain and disability for patients with plantar fasciitis and metatarsalgia." An Unna boot is a special gauze (usually 4 inches wide and 10 yards long) bandage, which can be used for the treatment of venous stasis ulcers and other venous insufficiencies of the leg. The gauze is impregnated with a thick, creamy mixture of zinc oxide and calamine. The rationale for requesting Unna's Boot to the bilateral feet was not specified in the records provided. Evidence of venous stasis ulcers or other venous insufficiencies of the leg was not specified in the records provided. The need for impregnation of the compression bandage with zinc oxide, in this patient, in the absence of documented venous stasis ulcers is not specified in the records provided. Patient has received an unspecified number of PT visits for this injury. Response to conservative treatment including PT and medication was not specified in the records provided. Response to "off the shelf" prefabricated orthotics is not specified in the records provided. Any evidence of diminished effectiveness of medications or intolerance to medications was not specified in the records provided. The request for Unna's Boot to the bilateral feet is not medically necessary for this patient.