

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0068717		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/14/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/18/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/01/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/13/2014

### 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 Pain Management 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 77-year-old male with an 11/18/10 date of injury. At the time (3/21/14) of request for authorization for MRI Lumbar, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain) and objective (limited range of motion of the lumbar spine and tenderness to palpation over the lumbar spine) findings, current diagnoses (lumbar spondylosis and left lumbar radiculopathy), and treatment to date (physical therapy and medications). There is no documentation of red flag diagnoses where plain film radiographs are negative; objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination, and the patient is being considered for surgery.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI Lumbar:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back, MRI

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints  
Page(s): 303-304.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS reference to ACOEM guidelines identifies documentation of red flag diagnoses where plain film radiographs are negative; objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination, failure of conservative treatment, and who are considered for surgery, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of MRI. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of lumbar spondylosis and left lumbar radiculopathy. In addition, there is documentation of failure of conservative treatment. However, there is no documentation of red flag diagnoses where plain film radiographs are negative; objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination, and the patient is being considered for surgery. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for MRI Lumbar is not medically necessary.