Case Number:	CM15-0129626		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2015	Date of Injury:	10/06/2011
Decision Date:	08/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/06/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, 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 injured worker is a 55 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on October 06, 2011. Medical records provided by the treating physician did not indicate the injured worker's mechanism of injury. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left sacroiliitis, lumbar facet joint arthritis, lumbar degenerative disc disease, and left lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date has included medication regimen, magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine, and electromyogram with nerve conduction study. In a progress note dated May 05, 2015 the treating physician reports complaints of persistent, throbbing, aching low back pain. Examination reveals tenderness to the left posterior superior iliac spine, positive Patrick test to the left, antalgic gait, and anxiety with depression. The injured worker's pain level was rated an 8 out 10. The treating physician requested a lumbar brace with ice pack and insert for pain and custom fit shoe inserts to support the injured worker with mobility and for postural maintenance.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar brace with ice pack and insert: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. A lumbar corset is recommended for prevention and not for treatment. Therefore, the request for Lumbar Brace is not medically necessary.

Custom fit shoe inserts: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Orthotic devices. http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html.

Decision rationale: According to ODG guidelines, Orthotic devices Recommended for plantar fasciitis and for foot pain in rheumatoid arthritis. See also Prostheses (artificial limb). Both prefabricated and custom orthotic devices are recommended for plantar heel pain (plantar fasciitis, plantar fasciosis, heel spur syndrome). (Thomas, 2010) Orthoses should be cautiously prescribed in treating plantar heel pain for those patients who stand for long periods; stretching exercises and heel pads are associated with better outcomes than custom made orthoses in people who stand for more than eight hours per day. (Crawford, 2003) As part of the initial treatment of proximal plantar fasciitis, when used in conjunction with a stretching program, a prefabricated shoe insert is more likely to produce improvement in symptoms than a custom polypropylene orthotic device or stretching alone. The percentages improved in each group were: (1) silicone insert, 95%; (2) rubber insert, 88%; (3) felt insert, 81%; (4) Achilles tendon and plantar fascia stretching only, 72%; and (5) custom orthosis, 68%. (Pfeffer, 1999) Evidence indicates mechanical treatment with taping and orthoses to be more effective than either anti-inflammatory or accommodative modalities in the treatment of plantar fasciitis. (Lynch, 1998) (Gross, 2002) For ankle sprains, the use of an elastic bandage has fewer complications than taping but appears to be associated with a slower return to work, and more reported instability than a semi-rigid ankle support. Lace-up ankle support appears effective in reducing swelling in the short-term compared with semi-rigid ankle support, elastic bandage and tape. (Kerkhoffs, 2002) For hallux valgus the evidence suggests that orthoses and night splints do not appear to be any more beneficial in improving outcomes than no treatment. (Ferrari-Cochrane, 2004) Semirigid foot orthotics appear to be more effective than supportive shoes worn alone or worn with soft orthoses for metatarsalgia. (Chalmers, 2000) The use of shock absorbing inserts in footwear probably reduces the incidence of stress fractures. There is insufficient evidence to determine the best design of such inserts but comfort and tolerability should be considered. Rehabilitation after tibial stress fracture may be aided by the use of pneumatic bracing but more evidence is required to confirm this. (Rome-Cochrane, 2005) Foot orthoses produce small short-term benefits in function and may also produce small reductions in pain for people with plantar fasciitis, but they do not have long-term beneficial effects compared with a sham device. The customized and prefabricated orthoses used in this trial have similar effectiveness in the treatment of plantar fasciitis. (Landorf, 2006) Eleven trials involving 1332 participants were included in this meta- analysis: five trials evaluated custom-made foot orthoses for plantar fasciitis (691 participants); three for foot pain in rheumatoid arthritis (231 participants); and one for hallux valgus (209 participants). Custom-made foot orthoses were effective for rear foot pain in rheumatoid arthritis (NNT:4) and painful hallux valgus (NNT:6); however, surgery was even more effective for hallux valgus. It is unclear if custom-made foot orthoses were effective for plantar fasciitis or metatarsophalangeal joint pain in rheumatoid arthritis. (Hawke, 2008) Rocker

profile shoes are commonly prescribed based on theoretical considerations with minimal scientific study and validation. Rocker profiles are used to afford pressure relief for the plantar surface of the foot, to limit the need for sagittal plane motion in the joints of the foot and to alter gait kinetics and kinematics in proximal joints. In this review, efficacy has not been demonstrated. The effectiveness of rocker-soled shoes in restricting sagittal plane motion in individual joints of the foot is unclear. Rocker profiles have minimal effect on the kinetics and kinematics of the more proximal joints of the lower limb, but more significant effects are seen at the ankle. (Hutchins, 2009) According to this systematic review of treatment for ankle sprains, pneumatic braces provide beneficial ankle support and may prevent subsequent sprains during high-risk sporting activity. (Seah, 2011) In reducing the risk of plantar fasciitis at work, the use of shoe orthoses with a medial longitudinal arch and metatarsal pad may be used as a preventive or treatment strategy. (Werner, 2010) Outcomes from using a custom orthosis are highly variable and dependent on the skill of the fabricator and the material used. A trial of a prefabricated orthosis is recommended in the acute phase, but due to diverse anatomical differences many patients will require a custom orthosis for long-term pain control. A pre-fab orthosis may be made of softer material more appropriate in the acute phase, but it may break down with use whereas a custom semi-rigid orthosis may work better over the long term. See also Ankle foot orthosis (AFO).Bilateral orthotics: Bilateral foot orthotics/orthoses are not recommended to treat unilateral ankle-foot problems. (Song, 2009) See Limb length temporary adjustment device, where a heel/sole lift is recommended when it is necessary to balance the limb lengths from use of an orthotic device that will add more than 2 cm length to one lower extremity for a long duration. There is no documentation that the patient is suffering from a significant leg length discrepancy of more than 2cm. Therefore, the request for Custom fit shoe inserts is not medically necessary.