

Case Number:	CM15-0044481		
Date Assigned:	03/16/2015	Date of Injury:	06/10/2010
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/09/2015

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: Pennsylvania, Ohio, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 61 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/10/2010. He reported an injury to his left shoulder and neck. The mechanism of injury was not provided for review. The injured worker was diagnosed as status post left foot tendon repair (2012). Treatment to date has included surgery, therapy and medication management. Currently, progress notes from the treating provider dated 1/27/2015 and 5/16/2014 indicates the injured worker reported knee, low back and left foot pain.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI left foot/ankle: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 343.

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

Decision rationale: ACOEM recommends MRI imaging of the ankle with respect to a particular differential diagnosis, noting that soft tissue injuries to the ankle generally are not identifiable on

MRI imaging. The records in this case do not clearly document a differential diagnosis or clinical rationale for this requested study. Thus, this request is not supported by the records and treatment guidelines. This request is not medically necessary.