

Case Number:	CM14-0054443		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2014	Date of Injury:	08/29/2013
Decision Date:	08/07/2014	UR Denial Date:	04/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/23/2014

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 Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain management 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 29-year-old female with a 8/29/13 date of injury. At the time (4/9/14) of the UR Decision for Pain Consultation-Lumbar, there is documentation of subjective (lumbar pain, pelvis pain and bilateral radicular leg pain) and objective (decreased range of motion of the thoracolumbar spine and tenderness over the T7-S1 paraspinal muscles) findings, imaging findings (lumbar spine X-ray (11/4/13) report revealed mild degenerative changes, lumbar spine MRI (11/11/13) report revealed L5-S1 2mm central disc protrusion with no spinal canal or neural foramina stenosis, and EMG/NCS (2/18/14) report revealed no lumbar radiculopathy), current diagnoses (lumbar sprain, lumbar radiculopathy, and pelvic pain), and treatment to date (medications and acupuncture). There is no documentation that consultation is indicated to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pain Consultation-Lumbar: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 5 Cornerstones of Disability Prevention and Management Page(s): 89-92, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 31.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Independent Medical Examinations and consultations, page(s) 127.

Decision rationale: The MTUS reference to ACOEM guidelines identifies that consultation is indicated to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity to support the medical necessity of consultation. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of lumbar sprain, lumbar radiculopathy, and pelvic pain. However, there is no documentation that consultation is indicated to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work. In addition, there is no documentation of a rationale identifying the medical necessity of the requested consultation. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Pain Consultation-Lumbar is not medically necessary.