

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

Independent Medical Review

P.O. Box 138009

Sacramento, CA 95813-8009

(855) 865-8873 Fax: (916) 605-4270



Independent Medical Review Final Determination Letter

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dated: 12/24/2013

Employee: [REDACTED]
Claim Number: [REDACTED]
Date of UR Decision: 7/3/2013
Date of Injury: 9/25/2003
IMR Application Received: 7/22/2013
MAXIMUS Case Number: CM13-0002279

DEAR [REDACTED]

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Medical Review (“IMR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IMR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

Final Determination: UPHOLD. This means we decided that none of the disputed items/services are medically necessary and appropriate. A detailed explanation of the decision for each of the disputed items/services is provided later in this letter.

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties.

In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 30 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations, [REDACTED]

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Sports Medicine, and is licensed to practice in New York and Texas. 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 physician 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/services.

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The physician reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The patient is a 39 year old female who reported an injury on 09/25/2003. She has had persistent left foot and ankle pain. Her diagnoses include osteochondral lesion of the talar dome and history of loose bodies, status post posterior tibial and peroneal tendon reconstruction for tendinosis, Achilles tendinitis, and recurrent falls and locking symptoms.

IMR DECISION(S) AND RATIONALE(S)

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

1. 1 custom molded orthotics is not medically necessary and appropriate.

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Ankle and Foot Complaints Chapter (ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 14), pg. 372, which is part of MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the Ankle and Foot Complaints Chapter (ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 14), pgs. 369-371, which is part of MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale:

According to the medical records provided for review, the employee's diagnoses include industrial injuries of the left foot and ankle, osteochondral lesion of the talar dome, history of loose bodies, status post posterior tibial and peroneal tendon reconstruction for tendinosis, Achilles tendinitis, and recurrent falls and locking symptoms. The physician is recommending treatment with an AFO brace, which the employee has used previously. According to the MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines, rigid orthotics (full-shoe-length inserts made to realign within the foot and from foot to leg) may reduce pain experienced during walking and may reduce more global measures of pain and disability for patients with plantar fasciitis and metatarsalgia. According to the provided medical records, the employee does not have any of the indications for use of this item. **The request for 1 custom molded orthotics is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

/reg

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.

[REDACTED]

CM13-0002279