

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0100622		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/19/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/12/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/26/2015

### 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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 61-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 19, 2007. He reported an injury to his neck and low back. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, work restrictions, cervical epidural steroid injection, acupuncture, EMG test of the bilateral upper extremities, and orthopedic consultation. Currently, the injured worker complains of constant mild to moderate pain in the neck which he rates a 4-5 on a 10-point scale. He reports numbness and tingling in the right middle, ring and small fingers and has weakness of the entire right upper extremity. He reports stiffness and tightness in the neck with frequent headaches and has limited range of motion of the cervical spine. He reports right shoulder pain which he rates a 3-4 on a 10-point scale and reports pain in the right hand and in all digits. He has frequent mild to intermittent moderate to occasional moderate to severe pain in the low back which he rates a 1-2 on a 10-point scale. He reports occasional radiation of pain down the lower extremities to the feet. His sitting and standing tolerances are one hour and his walking tolerance is more than two hours. The diagnoses associated with the request include cervical spine sprain/strain, lumbar spine sprain/strain, and right shoulder sprain/strain. The treatment plan includes MRI of the cervical spine and right shoulder, EMG studies of the bilateral upper extremities, continuation of medications and follow-up evaluation.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI cervical spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM, cervical and thoracic spine disorders, MRI.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-178.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. The provided progress notes fails to show any documentation of indications for imaging studies of the neck as outlined above per the ACOEM. There was no emergence of red flag. The neck pain was characterized as unchanged. The physical exam noted no evidence of new tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no planned invasive procedure. Therefore, criteria have not been met for a MRI of the neck and the request is not medically necessary.

**EMG/NCV (electromyography/nerve conduction velocity) bilateral upper extremities:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 178.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electrodiagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. 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. The assessment may include sensory-evoked potentials (SEPs) if spinal stenosis or spinal cord myelopathy is suspected. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding next steps, including the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, compute tomography [CT] for bony structures). Additional studies may be considered to further

define problem areas. The recent evidence indicates cervical disk annular tears may be missed on MRIs. The clinical significance of such a finding is unclear, as it may not correlate temporally or anatomically with symptoms. The provided documentation does not show any signs of emergence of red flags or subtle physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no mention of planned invasive procedures. There are no subtle neurologic findings listed on the physical exam. For these reasons criteria for special diagnostic testing has not been met per the ACOEM. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.