

Case Number:	CM15-0124504		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2015	Date of Injury:	04/27/2014
Decision Date:	08/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/29/2015

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: 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:

The injured worker is a 47 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 4/27/14. The injured worker has complaints of left ankle pain. The documentation noted that there is tenderness to palpation over the ankle. The diagnoses have included pain in joint, ankle and foot. Treatment to date has included left ankle surgery in September 2014; medications and physical therapy. The request was for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the left ankle and foot.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the left ankle: 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): 374.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on foot and ankle complaints states: For patients with continued limitations of activity after four weeks of symptoms and unexplained physical findings such as effusion or localized pain, especially following exercise, imaging may be indicated to clarify the diagnosis and assist reconditioning. Stress fractures may have a benign appearance, but point tenderness over the bone is indicative of the diagnosis and a radiograph or a bone scan may be ordered. Imaging findings should be correlated with physical findings. Disorders of soft tissue (such as tendinitis, metatarsalgia, fasciitis, and neuroma) yield negative radiographs and do not warrant other studies, e.g., magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Magnetic resonance imaging may be helpful to clarify a diagnosis such as osteochondritis dissecans in cases of delayed recovery. The review of the provided clinical documentation does not reveal physical exam results consistent with criteria for imaging as outlined above and the request is not medically necessary.

MRI of the 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): 374.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on foot and ankle complaints states: For patients with continued limitations of activity after four weeks of symptoms and unexplained physical findings such as effusion or localized pain, especially following exercise, imaging may be indicated to clarify the diagnosis and assist reconditioning. Stress fractures may have a benign appearance, but point tenderness over the bone is indicative of the diagnosis and a radiograph or a bone scan may be ordered. Imaging findings should be correlated with physical findings. Disorders of soft tissue (such as tendinitis, metatarsalgia, fasciitis, and neuroma) yield negative radiographs and do not warrant other studies, e.g., magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Magnetic resonance imaging may be helpful to clarify a diagnosis such as osteochondritis dissecans in cases of delayed recovery. The review of the provided clinical documentation does not reveal physical exam results consistent with criteria for imaging as outlined above and the request is not medically necessary.