

Case Number:	CM14-0062053		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2014	Date of Injury:	10/19/2006
Decision Date:	09/08/2014	UR Denial Date:	04/17/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/02/2014

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 Occupational 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:

The patient is a 55-year-old male who has submitted a claim for cervical spinal stenosis and spondylolysis associated with an industrial injury date of 10/19/2006. Medical records from 03/27/2013 to 07/09/2014 were reviewed and showed that patient complained of neck pain graded 4/10 and right and left arm pain graded 3/10. Physical examination revealed normal MMT and sensation to light touch of bilateral upper extremities. DTRs were 1+ throughout the upper extremities bilaterally. CT myelogram dated 03/17/2014 confirmed mild central stenosis and facet arthropathy at C2-3 and C3-4. MRI of the cervical spine dated 2012 revealed degenerative changes and stenosis at multiple levels. Treatment to date has included C4-7 anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (2008), physical therapy, epidural steroid injections, and pain medications. Utilization review dated 04/17/2014 denied the request for EMG/NCV of bilateral upper extremities because there was no evidence of focal neurologic deficits in a dermatomal or myotomal pattern.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Electromyography (EMG) of the bilateral extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007) Page(s): 238.

Decision rationale: According to page 238 of the CA MTUS ACOEM Practice Guidelines, EMG is recommended if cervical radiculopathy is suspected as a cause of lateral arm pain or if severe nerve entrapment is suspected on the basis of physical examination and denervation atrophy is likely. Moreover, guidelines do not recommend EMG before conservative treatment. In this case, the patient complained of neck pain graded 4/10 and right and left arm pain graded 3/10. Physical examination revealed normal motor and sensory findings and hyporeflexia(1+) bilaterally of the upper extremities. The patient's clinical manifestations were not consistent with a focal neurologic deficit. Therefore, the request for electromyography (EMG) of the bilateral extremities is not medically necessary.

Nerve Conduction Velocity (NCV) of bilateral upper extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 261-262. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back, Nerve Conduction Studies Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Nerve Conduction Studies in Polyneuropathy: Practical Physiology and Patterns of Abnormality, Acta Neurol Belg 2006 Jun; 106 (2): 73-81.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS ACOEM Guidelines state that appropriate electrodiagnostic studies may help differentiate between carpal tunnel syndrome and other conditions, such as cervical radiculopathy. These include nerve conduction studies, or in more difficult cases, electromyography may be helpful. Moreover, ODG states that NCS is not recommended to demonstrate radiculopathy if radiculopathy has already been clearly identified by EMG and obvious clinical signs, but is recommended if the EMG is not clearly consistent with radiculopathy. A published study entitled "Nerve Conduction Studies in Polyneuropathy" cited that NCS is an essential part of the work-up of peripheral neuropathies. Many neuropathic syndromes can be suspected on clinical grounds, but optimal use of nerve conduction study techniques allows diagnostic classification and is therefore crucial to understanding and separation of neuropathies. In this case, the patient complained of neck pain graded 4/10 and right and left arm pain graded 3/10. Physical examination revealed normal motor and sensory findings and hyporeflexia (1+) bilaterally of the upper extremities. The patient's clinical manifestations did not support the presence of symptoms of neuropathy. Therefore, the request for nerve conduction velocity (NCV) of bilateral upper extremities is not medically necessary.