

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0056534		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/09/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/29/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/17/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/10/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/27/2014

### 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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 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 41-year-old male with a 10/29/09 date of injury, and C5-6 and C6-7 anterior cervical decompression and fusion on 3/28/11. At the time (3/27/14) of request for authorization for MRI Lumbar spine, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain) and objective (diffuse tenderness and spasm over the lumbar spine area, decreased range of motion with pain, and positive bilateral straight leg raising test) findings, imaging findings (reported MRI of the lumbar spine (4/1/13) revealed a moderate disc bulge measuring 4.3mm in neutral, 4.3mm in flexion, and 5.7 mm in extension, causing mild bilateral neural foraminal narrowing , as well as moderate spinal canal narrowing; report not available for review), current diagnoses (displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy), and treatment to date (medications and physical therapy).

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI lumbar spine:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Minnesota Rules, 5221.6100 Parameters for Medical Imaging

**Decision rationale:** MTUS reference to ACOEM guidelines identifies documentation of red flag diagnoses where plain film radiographs are negative; objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination, failure of conservative treatment, and who are considered for surgery, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of MRI. OGD identifies documentation of a diagnosis/condition (with supportive subjective/objective findings) for which a repeat study is indicated (such as: To diagnose a suspected fracture or suspected dislocation, to monitor a therapy or treatment which is known to result in a change in imaging findings and imaging of these changes are necessary to determine the efficacy of the therapy or treatment (repeat imaging is not appropriate solely to determine the efficacy of physical therapy or chiropractic treatment), to follow up a surgical procedure, to diagnose a change in the patient's condition marked by new or altered physical findings) as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a repeat MRI. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of a diagnosis of displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy. In addition, there is documentation of a previous lumbar MRI (4/1/13). However, despite documentation of subjective (low back pain) and objective (diffuse tenderness and spasm over the lumbar spine area, decreased range of motion with pain, and positive bilateral straight leg raising test) findings, there is no documentation of diagnosis/condition for which a repeat study is indicated (to diagnose a suspected fracture or suspected dislocation, to monitor a therapy or treatment which is known to result in a change in imaging findings and imaging of these changes are necessary to determine the efficacy of the therapy or treatment, to follow up a surgical procedure, to diagnose a change in the patient's condition marked by new or altered physical findings). In addition, there is no documentation of an imaging report. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for MRI lumbar spine is not medically necessary.