

Case Number:	CM14-0211627		
Date Assigned:	12/24/2014	Date of Injury:	04/20/2010
Decision Date:	02/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/24/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/17/2014

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
 State(s) of Licensure: Texas
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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 31-year-old male who reported an injury on 04/20/2010. The mechanism of injury was not specifically stated. The current diagnosis is lumbago. The injured worker presented on 12/03/2014 with complaints of ongoing pain and lower extremity symptoms. The injured worker also reported difficulty-sleeping secondary to pain. Previous conservative treatment included physical therapy, medication management, and injections. There was no physical examination provided on that date. Treatment recommendations at that time included surgical intervention. It was noted that the injured worker underwent an MRI of the lumbar spine on 08/29/2013, which revealed mild degenerative changes.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Prospective request for 1 Total Lateral Interbody Fusion at T12-L1 w/ posterior instrumentation at T12-L1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 288, 305.

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 limitations for more than 1 month; clear clinical, imaging, and electrophysiologic evidence of a lesion; and a 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. While it is noted that the injured worker has exhausted conservative treatment, there was no documentation of spinal instability upon flexion and extension view radiographs. There was also no mention 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.

1 Day Inpatient Hospital Stay: 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: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

1 Pre-Operative Medical Clearance: 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: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

1 LSO Back 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: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

