

Case Number:	CM13-0041357		
Date Assigned:	12/20/2013	Date of Injury:	07/15/2007
Decision Date:	05/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/27/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/18/2013

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 Board Certified in Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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:

██████████ is a 45 year old woman who sustained a work related injury on July 15 2007. She subsequently developed chronic back pain for which she underwent lumbar laminectomy. The patient was diagnosed with post lumbar laminectomy syndrome and acute exacerbation of chronic lumbar pain. According to the note dated on July 15 2013, the patient continued to complain of left lumbar pain over 2-3 weeks radiating to left lower extremity. Physical examination demonstrated left side paraspinal tenderness. The patient received an injection with Dilaudid and Ketorolac.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MEDIAL BRANCH NERVE BLOCK L2-3 AND L3-4: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES (ODG) FACET JOINT INTRA-ARTICULAR INJECTIONS (THERAPEUTIC BLOCKS) ([HTTP://WORKLOSSDATAINSTITUTE.VERIOIPONLY.COM/ODGTWC/LOW_BACK.HTM#FACETJOINTINJECTIONS](http://worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/low_back.htm#facetjointinjections))

Decision rationale: According MTUS guidelines, <Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain. According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003) (Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti , 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial. Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, < Criteria for use of therapeutic intra-articular and medial branch blocks, are as follows: 1. No more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is recommended. 2. There should be no evidence of radicular pain, spinal stenosis, or previous fusion. 3. If successful (initial pain relief of 70%, plus pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). 4. No more than 2 joint levels may be blocked at any one time. 5. There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. The ODG guidelines did not support facet injection for lumbar pain in this clinical context. In addition ,there is no clear evidence of radiculopathy or documentation that lumbar facet as main pain generator. Therefore MEDIAL BRANCH NERVE BLOCK L2-3 AND L3 is not medically necessary.