MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0160708		
Date Assigned:	08/27/2015	Date of Injury:	12/09/1997
Decision Date:	10/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/17/2015

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, New York, California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 applicant is a represented [redacted] beneficiary who has filed a claim for chronic foot pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of December 9, 1997. In a Utilization Review report dated July 18, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for cephalexin (Keflex). The claims administrator referenced a July 8, 2015 RFA form in its determination. The claims administrator also cited a May 14, 2015 progress note in the determination. The claims administrator contended that there was no evidence of the applicant is having issues with cellulitis for which Keflex would have been indicated. The claims administrator contended that the review represented retrospective review of Keflex apparently prescribed and/or dispensed on April 23, 2015. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On March 27, 2015, the applicant underwent a plantar fascia release/fasciectomy of the right foot to ameliorate a preoperative diagnosis of plantar fasciitis. On April 15, 2015, the applicant was described as doing "very well" following earlier foot surgery of March 27, 2015. The applicant was nevertheless placed off work, on total temporary disability. There was no mention made of the need for Keflex on this date.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Cephalexin 500 mg #40 with a dos of 4/23/2015: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007), Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 47; 40.

Decision rationale: No, the request for cephalexin (Keflex), a cephalosporin antibiotic, was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. The MTUS Guideline in ACOEM Chapter 3, page 47 stipulates that an attending provider incorporate some discussion of efficacy of medication for the particular condition for which it has been prescribed into his choice of recommendations so as to ensure proper usage and so as to manage expectations. Here, however, the attending provider's April 15, 2015 progress note did not clearly state why Keflex (cephalexin) was prescribed and/or dispensed on or around the date in question, April 23, 2015, i.e., some one month removed from the date of the applicant's plantar fasciectomy procedure of March 27, 2015. While the MTUS Guideline in ACOEM Chapter 10, Table 4, page 40 does recommend systemic antibiotics such as Keflex for applicants with infected bursa, or, by implication, other infected regions, areas, and/or body parts, here, again, the documentation on file did not establish the presence of the applicant's having developed issues with a localized infection of cellulitis for which cephalexin (Keflex) would have been indicated. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.