

Case Number:	CM14-0193323		
Date Assigned:	12/01/2014	Date of Injury:	09/05/2011
Decision Date:	01/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/18/2014

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 Acupuncture & Pain 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:

49y/o female injured worker with date of injury 9/5/11 with related neck pain. Per progress report dated 10/1/14, the injured worker reported residual cervical spine pain following epidural injection 8/2014. Per physical exam, she had positive axial head compression test and limitation of cervical spine range of motion. MRI of the cervical spine congenital canal narrowing and superimposed degenerative spondylosis resulting in moderate-to-severe canal stenosis at C3-C4, C4-C5, and C6-C7. There was neural foraminal narrowing at C3-C4, C5-C6, and C6-C7. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, epidural steroid injection, and medication management. The date of UR decision was 11/14/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Repeat Cervical Interlaminar Epidural Injection (ESI) at left C6-7: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 174-175.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS CPMTG, epidural steroid injections are used to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active

treatment programs and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term benefit. The criteria for the use of epidural steroid injections are as follows: "1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing.2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, non-steroidal (NSAIDs) and muscle relaxants).3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance.4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections.5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks.6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session.7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007)8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections."The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker underwent cervical epidural steroid injection in August 2014 with resultant 50% reduction in pain; however, there was no documentation of the duration of pain relief, functional improvement, or associated reduction in medication usage. Without such documentation, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.