

Case Number:	CM14-0059718		
Date Assigned:	08/08/2014	Date of Injury:	03/31/1998
Decision Date:	11/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	04/24/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/30/2014

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 Orthopedic Spine Surgery and is licensed to practice in Texas. 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:

The injured worker is a 52-year-old male who reported an injury on March 31, 1998. The mechanism of injury was not stated. The current diagnosis is L4-5 and L5-S1 retrolisthesis with disc herniation and radiculopathy. The injured worker was evaluated on April 07, 2014 with complaints of persistent neck and lower back pain. Previous conservative treatment is noted to include physical therapy, epidural injections, facet injections, trigger point injections, home exercise, and medications. Physical examination revealed diminished motor strength in the bilateral lower extremities, decreased sensation in the L4-S1 distribution on the right and L5-S1 distribution on the left. Treatment recommendations at that time included an L4-5 and L5-S1 decompression and possible fusion. There was no Request for Authorization form submitted for this review. The injured worker underwent an MRI of the lumbar spine on March 21, 2014, which indicated disc space narrowing with loss of nucleus pulposus signal intensity at L4-5 with moderate central canal narrowing, and moderate bilateral neural foraminal narrowing.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Posterior Lumbar decompression and fusion L4-S1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 305-306. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Fusion (spinal).

Decision rationale: The California MTUS/ACOEM Practice Guidelines state a referral for surgical consultation is indicated for patients who have severe and disabling lower extremity symptoms, activity limitation for more than 1 month, clear clinical, imaging, and electrophysiologic evidence of a lesion, and failure of conservative treatment. The Official Disability Guidelines state preoperative surgical indications for a spinal fusion should include the identification and treatment of all pain generators, the completion of all physical medicine and manual therapy interventions, documented instability upon x-ray or CT myelogram, spine pathology that is limited to 2 levels, and a psychosocial screening. As per the documentation submitted, the injured worker has exhausted conservative treatment; however, there was no documentation of spinal instability upon flexion and extension view radiographs. There was also no documentation of a psychosocial screening prior to the request for a lumbar fusion. Based on the clinical information received and the above mentioned guidelines, the request is not medically appropriate.

Medical Pre-Operative clearance with [REDACTED] (to include, labs, and 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Lumbar Brace: 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Orthofix (external bone growth stimulator): 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Elevated Toilet seat: 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Front Wheel Walker: 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

reacher/grabber: 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Psychological clearance with [REDACTED]: 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Post -Operative Physical Therapy (9-sessions): 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.

Post -Operative Aquatic 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: As the injured worker's surgical procedure has not been authorized, the current request is also not medically necessary.