

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0100683		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/09/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/22/2015
<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: Texas, Florida, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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:

This 58 year old man sustained an industrial injury on 4/9/2014. The mechanism of injury is not detailed. Diagnoses include spine sprain/strain with right upper extremity radiculopathy, closed head injury with dizziness and headaches, and lumbar spine sprain/strain with absent bilateral ankle reflexes. Treatment has included oral medications, physician therapy, use of cane, chiropractic treatment, and acupuncture. Physician notes dated 2/25/2015 show complaints of persistent daily headaches, cervical spine pain rated 6/10, and lumbar spine pain rated 6/10. Recommendations include acupuncture, physical therapy, neurology follow up, Ultram, Prilosec, MRIs of the cervical and lumbar spine, trigger point injections, and follow up in three to four weeks.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) of the cervical spine:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) ACOEM, Page 303, Low Back, regarding imaging.

**Decision rationale:** The original injuries were of the sprain-strain variety. There was no apparent structural damage. The doctor on 2-25-15 described pain, there were no objective neurologic findings. Although there is subjective information presented in regarding increasing pain, there are no accompanying physical signs. The case would therefore not meet the MTUS-ACOEM criteria for cervical, magnetic imaging, due to the lack of objective, unequivocal neurologic physical examination findings documenting either a new radiculopathy, or a significant change in a previously documented radiculopathy. The guides state: Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminate imaging will result in false positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. The request is not medically necessary.

**MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) of the lumbar spine:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine Page 303, Low Back Complaints.

**Decision rationale:** The original injuries were of the sprain-strain variety. There was no apparent structural damage. The doctor on 2-25-15 described pain, There were no objective neurologic findings. Under MTUS/ACOEM, although there is subjective information presented in regarding increasing pain, there are little accompanying physical signs. Even if the signs are of an equivocal nature, the MTUS note that electro diagnostic confirmation generally comes first. They note Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The guides warn that indiscriminate imaging will result in false positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. I did not find electro diagnostic studies. It can be said that ACOEM is intended for more acute injuries; therefore other evidence-based guides were also examined. The ODG guidelines note, in the Low Back Procedures section: Lumbar spine trauma: trauma, neurological deficit; Lumbar spine trauma: seat belt (chance) fracture (If focal, radicular findings or other neurologic deficit); Uncomplicated low back pain, suspicion of cancer, infection; Uncomplicated low back pain, with radiculopathy, after at least 1 month conservative therapy, sooner if severe or progressive neurologic deficit. (For unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 382-383.) (Andersson, 2000); Uncomplicated low back pain, prior lumbar surgery; Uncomplicated low back pain, cauda equina syndrome. These criteria are also not met in this case; the request was not medically necessary under the MTUS and other evidence-based criteria.

**Tramadol 50mg, #60 1 refill:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain interventions and treatments Page(s): 12,13 83 and 113 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS, Tramadol is an opiate analogue medication, not recommended as a first-line therapy. The MTUS based on Cochrane studies found very small pain improvements, and adverse events caused participants to discontinue the medicine. Most important, there are no long-term studies to allow it to be recommended for use past six months. A long term use of is therefore not supported. The request is not medically necessary.