

Case Number:	CM14-0132972		
Date Assigned:	09/03/2014	Date of Injury:	10/11/2000
Decision Date:	09/25/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/04/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/19/2014

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 Board Certified in Family 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:

This is a 42-year-old female patient who reported an industrial injury on 10/11/2000, almost 14 years ago, attributed to the performance of her customary job tasks. The patient is reported by her chiropractor to complain of neck and upper back where a pain, which had occurred one day prior. The pain was reported to radiate into the upper extremities. The patient also complained of headaches and sleep disturbances. The objective findings on examination included neck and upper back muscle spasms and tenderness, trigger points, reduced cervical spine range of motion, positive findings of cervical root compression, fixations in the cervical spine. The treatment plan was for a MRI of the cervical spine

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Cervical Spine MRI: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 178. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 182, 177-178.

Decision rationale: The request for a MRI of the cervical spine was not supported with objective findings on examination to support medical necessity. There are no demonstrated red flag diagnoses as recommended by the ACOEM Guidelines in order to establish the criteria recommended for a MRI of the cervical spine. The medical necessity of the requested MRI of the cervical spine was not supported with the subjective/objective findings recommend by the ACOEM Guidelines or the Official Disability Guidelines for the authorization of a cervical spine MRI. The patient's treatment plan did not demonstrate an impending surgical intervention or any red flag diagnoses. The treatment plan was not demonstrated to be influenced by the obtaining of the Cervical MRI. There were no demonstrated sensory or motor neurological deficits on physical examination; there were no demonstrated changes to the patient's neurological examination other than the subjective pain complaint; and the patient was not shown to have failed a conservative program of strengthening and conditioning. The patient is not documented as contemplating surgical intervention to the cervical spine. There were no documented clinical changes in the patient's clinical status or documented motor/sensory neurological deficits that would warrant the authorization of a MRI of the cervical spine/thoracic spine or meet the recommendations of the currently accepted evidence-based guidelines. There is no provided rationale for the MRI of the cervical spine/thoracic spine by the requesting provider. The MRI results were not noted to affect the course of the recommended conservative treatment. The functional assessment for the provided conservative therapy since the date of injury has not been documented or provided in the physical therapy documentation. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.