

Case Number:	CM14-0081646		
Date Assigned:	07/18/2014	Date of Injury:	05/18/1993
Decision Date:	09/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/22/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/02/2014

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 Preventative 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 69-year-old female with a 5/18/93 date of injury, and status post L4-S1 fusion (undated). At the time (5/13/14) of request for authorization for 1 bilateral S1 epidural injection under fluoroscopy, there is documentation of subjective (back pain with left leg numbness and right thigh burning pain) and objective (tender left paraspinal area with tightness, mild tender left sacroiliac joints and moderate L4/5, L5/S1 levels, lumbar flexion painful at 35 degrees, extension 15 degrees, right and left lateral bending 15 degrees, iliac compression, posterior sacral compression positive, straight leg raise positive right greater than left, sensation reduced left lateral foot to pinprick and light touch, and antalgic gait) findings, current diagnoses (lumbar post-laminectomy syndrome, lumbar or lumbosacral disc degeneration, lumbosacral neuritis, sacroiliitis, lumbar spinal stenosis, and myalgia and myositis), and treatment to date (previous bilateral S1 epidural steroid injection on 1/15/14 with 60-70% pain relief). There is no documentation of decreased need for pain medications and functional response following previous injection.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 bilateral S1 epidural injection under fluoroscopy: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections (ESIs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Epidural Steroid Injections (ESIs).

Decision rationale: MTUS reference to ACOEM guidelines identifies documentations of objective radiculopathy in an effort to avoid surgery as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of epidural steroid injections. ODG identifies documentation of at least 50-70% pain relief for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year, as well as decreased need for pain medications, and functional response as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of additional epidural steroid injections. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of lumbar post-laminectomy syndrome, lumbar or lumbosacral disc degeneration, lumbosacral neuritis, sacroiliitis, lumbar spinal stenosis, and myalgia and myositis. In addition, there is documentation of a previous bilateral S1 epidural steroid injection on 1/15/14. Furthermore, there is documentation of at least 50-70% pain relief for six to eight weeks. However, there is no documentation of decreased need for pain medications and functional response following previous injection. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for 1 bilateral S1 epidural injection under fluoroscopy is not medically necessary.