

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0075677		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/27/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/03/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/22/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/13/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/21/2015

### 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:

This 40 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 5/3/12. He subsequently reported right ankle, right foot and low back injury and pain. Diagnoses include lumbar fracture. Treatments to date have included nerve conduction and MRI studies, injections, physical therapy, acupuncture, orthotics and prescription pain medications. The injured worker continues to experience pain in the low back and right lower extremity. Upon examination, there was reduced range of motion and tenderness laterally in the right ankle. A request for a Podiatry consultation (2nd opinion) was made by the treating physician.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Podiatry consultation (2nd opinion):** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Guidelines, Chapter 7, page 127.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment.

**Decision rationale:** Per the ACOEM :The health practitioner may refer to other specialist if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability. The patient has ongoing foot pain despite surgical intervention. The request for a podiatry consult is medically warranted and certified.