MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0146866		
Date Assigned:	09/12/2014	Date of Injury:	09/14/2004
Decision Date:	10/06/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/26/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/10/2014

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. The expert reviewer is licensed in Podiatric surgery and is licensed to practice in New York. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

According to the enclosed information the original date of injury for this patient was 9/14/2004. Apparently patient stepped into a hole in the ground injuring his left foot. On 1/21/2014 this patient was seen by his podiatrist for evaluation of bilateral foot pain. The patient relates that he stopped taking his Meloxicam a few months ago, and his foot pain has worsened. He also presents stating that he is due for a new pair of orthotics. The musculoskeletal exam was positive or foot pain. Hammertoe contractures noted to the right second digit and pain upon palpation about the right third MPJ area. Diagnoses include right foot pain, capsulitis of the second and third MPJ right side, fatigue of the feet and legs, and plantar fasciitis bilaterally, currently controlled with custom orthotics. Patient was advised to continue with home stretching exercises, plantar fascia night splint, non-steroid anti-inflammatory medication and orthotics for plantar fasciitis. On 2/27/2014 patient was fitted for his new custom orthotics. They appear to fit well. On 8/5/2014 patient presents to his podiatrist for follow-up evaluation. The patient reports no change in symptoms and advises that he is ready for a new pair of orthotics as he is supposed to get them every six months. Overall patient states that he is doing well. He does state that weight-bearing aggravates his symptoms. The physical exam is essentially unchanged since last visit. The diagnoses remain the same. The podiatrist states that they will seek preauthorization for new orthotics. An important point to mention is that there is no evaluation of the orthotics themselves, their condition, or how they are holding up.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Custom molded foot orthotics # 2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 367-373, 376, 377.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 371.

Decision rationale: After careful review of the enclosed information and the pertinent MTUS guidelines for this case, it is my feeling that the decision for "custom molded foot orthotics, quantity # 2" is not medically indicated for this patient at this time. The MTUS guidelines to state that custom rigid orthotics may be used to treat patients with painful plantar fasciitis and or painful metatarsalgia. It is well documented that this patient suffers with both of these ailments, and is already being treated with custom orthotics. The progress notes state that this patient's foot pain is controlled with his current custom orthotics. There is a statement made by the patient that he is able to get orthotics every six months; however this is out of the norm. Generally, patients are entitled to orthotics about once a year as orthotics may demonstrate breakdown and people's feet do change. The key to this case is that there is no documentation on the condition of patient's current orthotics. The patient is already being treated with custom orthotics, and there is no documented medical reason why patient would require a second pair in only six months after having been dispensed a new pair. Therefore, the request of Custom molded foot orthotics # 2 is not medically necessary and appropriate.