

Case Number:	CM15-0141408		
Date Assigned:	07/31/2015	Date of Injury:	08/27/2014
Decision Date:	09/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/21/2015

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, North Carolina
 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:

This is a 56-year-old male with an August 27, 2014 date of injury. A progress note dated June 18, 2015 documents subjective complaints (left ankle pain with radiation into the lateral aspect of the foot, occasionally into the plantar arch, and into the lateral aspect of the calf; pain rated at a level of 3 out of 10 at its least and 6 out of 10 at its worst; tingling and numbness to the lateral aspect of the ankle; sleeplessness), objective findings (slight swelling of the left ankle compared to the right; moderate hyperpigmentation over the inferior and posterior aspects of the ankle; slight tenderness of the anterior and posterior talofibular ligaments and of the calcaneofibular ligament; minimal tenderness of the posterior third of the plantar fascia at the plantar aspect of the calcaneus; tenderness at the medial aspect of the plantar arch; slight soft tissue swelling surrounding the ankle without evidence of effusion; decreased range of motion of the left ankle; equinovarus stress testing causes discomfort at the level of the fracture site; tarsal Tinel's testing is positive at the medial plantar nerve; dorsal pedis and posterior tibial pulses are non-palpable; atrophy of the left thigh as compared to the right; gait is with a moderate lurch to the left, with a popping when initiating weight bearing, with limited push off and modest heel strike; heel walking can be accomplished with a moderate limp on the left and toe waling is accomplished with a lesser limp on the left), and current diagnoses (ankle fracture unspecified, closed). Treatments to date have included medications, orthotics, medications, ice, heat, and use of a cane. The treating physician documented a plan of care that included eight-inch lace up waterproof wolverine boots (replacement).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Eight inch lace up waterproof wolverine boots (replacement) directed to the diagnosis of ankle fracture 9 months ago: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The patient suffered a left ankle fracture approximately 1 year ago and requests replacement Wolverine waterproof work boots (8-inch lace-up) to prevent left ankle slippage and inversion/eversion. The requested work boots are not considered durable medical equipment and are available for over the counter purchase. There is no rationale for the medical necessity of these boots one year post-fracture. There is no documentation of ankle instability. The PCM has not provided any clinical rationale of how the prescribed boots are medically necessary for the treatment of the effects of this industrial injury as opposed to ordinary appropriately fitting boots or shoes. Therefore, the request is deemed not medically necessary.