

Case Number:	CM15-0007694		
Date Assigned:	01/26/2015	Date of Injury:	10/21/2013
Decision Date:	03/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/13/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 21 year old female who suffered a work related injury on 10/21/13. Per the physician notes from 12/31/14, the treatment plan includes referral to an orthopedist and a referral to a neurologist for an EMG/NCV if the bilateral lower extremities. On 01/08/15, the Claims Administrator non-certified the orthopedist, citing ACOEM guidelines and the neurologist and EMG/NCV, citing MTUS and ODG guidelines. The non-certified treatments were subsequently appealed for Independent Medical Review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Evaluation and Treatment with an Orthopedist: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs, early intervention Page(s): 32-33.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, the presence of red flags may indicate the need for specialty consultation. In addition, the requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for a pain management evaluation with a specialist. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. In this case, there is no clear documentation for the rationale for the request for an office visit for Ortho. The requesting physician did not provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for this visit. The provider documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. Therefore, the request for Evaluation and Treatment with an Orthopedist is not medically necessary.

Neurologist consult with an EMG/NCV of the bilateral lower extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127; Official Disability Guidelines, Pain Chapter, Electrodiagnostic testing

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines (MTUS page 303 from ACOEM guidelines), “Electromyography (EMG), including H-reflex tests, may be useful to identify subtle, focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than three or four weeks.” EMG has excellent ability to identify abnormalities related to disc protrusion (MTUS page 304 from ACOEM guidelines). According to MTUS guidelines, needle EMG study helps identify subtle neurological focal dysfunction in patients with neck and arm symptoms. “When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks” (page 178). EMG is indicated to clarify nerve dysfunction in case of suspected disc herniation (page 182). EMG is useful to identify physiological insult and anatomical defect in case of neck pain (page 179). In this case, there is no clear evidence that the patient developed peripheral nerve dysfunction or nerve root dysfunction. MTUS guidelines do not recommend EMG/NCV without signs of radiculopathy or nerve dysfunction. Therefore, the request for EMG/NCV study of the bilateral lower extremities is not medically necessary.