

Case Number:	CM14-0167760		
Date Assigned:	10/14/2014	Date of Injury:	08/28/2007
Decision Date:	11/18/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/26/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/10/2014

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 Board Certified in Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture & Pain 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:

58-years old female injured worker was with date of injury 8/28/07 with related neck, back, and right shoulder pain. Per progress report dated 9/9/14, the injured worker reported her pain was associated with weakness and numbness in the left hand and giving way of the right leg, as well as grinding of the left knee and swelling in both shoulders. Per physical exam, the injured worker had 4/5 strength of the lumbar spine with flexion, extension, and lateral bending. Range of motion was restricted due to pain. MRI of the lumbar spine dated 11/2/11 revealed a disc protrusion was L5-S1 with impingement on the left L5 nerve root. MRI of the cervical spine dated 11/2/11 revealed 2 to 3mm posterior C3-C4, C4-C5, C5-C6, and C6-C7 disc protrusions indenting and impinging on the anterior thecal sac, but that were not responsible for any significant spinal canal stenosis. The documentation submitted for review did not state whether physical therapy was utilized. Treatment to date has included medication management. The date of UR decision was 9/26/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar Epidural Steroid Injection (ESI): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injection (ESI) Page(s): 46.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, epidural steroid injections are used to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term benefit. The criteria for the use of epidural steroid injections are as follows: 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or Electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) 8) Current researches do not support "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The documentation submitted for review contained only partial findings of radiculopathy manifested as weakness. MRI findings did corroborate radiculopathy at L5. The documentation submitted does not include EMG/NCS. Above mentioned citation conveys radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or Electrodiagnostic testing. Radiculopathy is defined as two of the following: weakness, sensation deficit, or diminished/absent reflexes associated with the relevant dermatome. These findings are not documented, so medical necessity is not affirmed. Furthermore, the level of the requested procedure was not specified. As the first criteria is not met, and the requested level is not specified, the Lumbar Epidural Steroid Injection (ESI) is not medically necessary.