

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0047560		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/27/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/23/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	02/20/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/07/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/04/2013

### 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 Interventional Spine 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 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. 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:

This is a 68 year-old male with an 8/23/07 industrial injury claim. He has been diagnosed with multilevel lumbago with radiculopathy, bilateral; SI joint and facet joint arthropathy; multilevel cervicalgia with radiculopathy; extensive myofascial pain syndrome; cervicogenic headaches; reactive sleep disturbance; reactive depression; repeated falls. The IMR application shows a dispute with the 10/7/13 UR denial of bilateral SI joint blocks. The 10/7/13 UR letter is from [REDACTED], and the denial was because the reviewer did not see documentation of conservative care for the SI joint pain.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Sacroiliac joint injection bilaterally:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Treatment/Disability Guidelines, Hip and Pelvis (Acute and Chronic) (Updated 3/19/13), criteria for the use of sacroiliac

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Hip Chapter for SI joint blocks.

**Decision rationale:** There is limited information provided for this IMR. There are two reports from Dr. ■■■, one dated 9/16/13 and the other is 11/26/13. UR had denied the request for bilateral SI joint injections, because there was no documentation of conservative care. MTUS and ACOEM do not specifically discuss SI joint injections, so ODG guidelines were consulted. ODG has specific requirements for SI joint blocks. As UR had pointed out, ODG states: "The patient has had and failed at least 4-6 weeks of aggressive conservative therapy including PT, home exercise and medication management" The 9/16/13 and 11/26/13 reports from ■■■ did not discuss PT or conservative care or failed medications. The physician's rationale was that the patient had SI injections in the past and even an sacroiliac RFA procedure. There is no indication that the patient had failed 4-6 weeks of conservative care prior to the prior SI injections or RFA and there is no documentation that the prior injections or RFA resulted in improved function consistent with the guidelines. Based on the information provided for this IMR, the physician has not met the reporting requirement to show failure of conservative care, PT and medications. Another ODG requirement is: "The history and physical should suggest the diagnosis (with documentation of at least 3 positive exam findings as listed above)." The 11/26/13 exam shows only 2 of the exam findings, pelvic rock and seated flexion tests. Based on the two available medical reports provided for IMR, the ODG criteria for the bilateral SI joint blocks has not been met.