

Case Number:	CM13-0047584		
Date Assigned:	12/27/2013	Date of Injury:	06/10/2012
Decision Date:	09/12/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/16/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/04/2013

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 Orthopedic Surgery 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:

A 46 year old male claimant with industrial injury noted on 6/10/12. MRI lumbar spine from 6/18/12 demonstrates 2-3 mm disc bulge with annular fissure in the posterior aspect of the disc. Report of lumbar discogram from 9/16/13 reports concordant pain at L4/5 level. Exam note on 9/20/13 demonstrates complaint of severe low back pain. Report is made of failure of nonoperative management consisting of pain management. Exam noted from 9/20/13 demonstrates decreased range of motion, decreased sensation and muscle weakness in the L4/5 dermatome on the right. No evidence of instability is noted in medical records.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

POSTERIOR INTERBODY DECOMPRESSION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 308-310.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 307. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Fusion.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM Guidelines Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints page 307 state that lumbar fusion, "Except for cases of trauma-related spinal fracture or dislocation, fusion of the spine is not usually considered during the first three months of symptoms. Patients with

increased spinal instability (not work-related) after surgical decompression at the level of degenerative spondylolisthesis may be candidates for fusion. "According to the ODG, Low back, Fusion (spinal) should be considered for 6 months of symptom. Indications for fusion include neural arch defect, segmental instability with movement of more than 4.5 mm, revision surgery where functional gains are anticipated, infection, tumor, deformity and after a third disc herniation. In this particular patient there is lack of medical necessity for lumbar fusion as there is no evidence of segmental instability or significant neural impingement to warrant fusion. There is no attached upright radiograph demonstrating motion at the requested segment to be fused. The MRI from 6/18/12 does not demonstrate any neural compression. Therefore the determination is non-certification for lumbar fusion.

REMOVAL OF SPINAL LAMINA: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

POSTERIOR LUMBAR INSTRUMENTATION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM, SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS, 308-310.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

POSTERIOR LUMBAR FUSION: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM, SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS, 308-310.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 307. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Lumbar Fusion.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM Guidelines Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints page 307 state that lumbar fusion, "Except for cases of trauma-related spinal fracture or dislocation, fusion of the spine is not usually considered during the first three months of symptoms. Patients with increased spinal instability (not work-related) after surgical decompression at the level of

degenerative spondylolisthesis may be candidates for fusion. "According to the ODG, Low back, Fusion (spinal) should be considered for 6 months of symptom. Indications for fusion include neural arch defect, segmental instability with movement of more than 4.5 mm, revision surgery where functional gains are anticipated, infection, tumor, deformity and after a third disc herniation. In this particular patient there is lack of medical necessity for lumbar fusion as there is no evidence of segmental instability or significant neural impingement to warrant fusion. There is no attached upright radiograph demonstrating motion at the requested segment to be fused. The MRI from 6/18/12 does not demonstrate any neural compression. Therefore the determination is non-certification for lumbar fusion.

ADDITIONAL LUMBAR REPAIRS: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

SPINAL ALIOGRAFT: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP MEDICAL CLEARANCE: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

ASSISTANT SURGEON: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP PSYCHOLOGICAL CLEARANCE: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP CBC: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP SMA-7: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP U/A: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP EKG: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP PREGNANCY TEST: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

PRE-OP PHYSICAL THERAPY: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.