

Case Number:	CM14-0214979		
Date Assigned:	01/07/2015	Date of Injury:	12/27/2006
Decision Date:	03/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/25/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/22/2014

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 patient is a 28-year-old man who sustained a work related injury on December 27, 2006. The was diagnosed with metatarsalgia and hammertoe deformities of the toes, with pes planus. A left ankle MRI dated May 2, 2007 showed a small fluid collection below the peroneal tendons, within the calcaneal cuboid joint, small joint efgfusion in the tibiotalar joint, mild tenosynovitis of the flexor tendons, and mild marrow edema in the inferior aspect of the calcaneus from contusive changes or stress fracture. A left foot MRI dated February 19, 2008 showed evidence suggestive of post-traumatic injury with marrow edema or possible infectious process and unexpected bone marrow edema of the calcaneus. A left foot x-ray dated March 26, 2013 showed unremarkable findings. The progress report dated November 12, 2014 contained illegible handwritten notes. According to this report, the patient complained of left foot pain. Legible examination findings revealed antalgic gait and no change to PE.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of left foot: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 375.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, MRI of the ankle is recommended in case of tendinitis, neuroma and ligament tear. There is no clinical evidence to support all these diagnosis. In addition, the swelling may complicate the physical examination. It is recommended to reevaluate the patient after swelling resolution.