

Case Number:	CM15-0107643		
Date Assigned:	06/12/2015	Date of Injury:	07/11/2008
Decision Date:	07/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/04/2015

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: Arizona, California
 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 53 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/11/2008. The mechanism of injury is reported as a trip and fall. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar disc disease, lumbar radiculopathy and lumbar facet syndrome. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medication management. A pain management consultation from 4/17/2015 revealed the injured worker complained of low back pain rated 8/10 with tenderness to palpation. The treating physician is requesting urine drug screen, bilateral lumbar 4-5 transforaminal epidural steroid injection x 2 and interferential unit for a 30 day trial.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Urine toxicology screening: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), UDT.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines urine toxicology Page(s): 92-93.

Decision rationale: According to the California MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, urine toxicology screen is used to assess presence of illicit drugs or to monitor adherence to prescription medication program. There is no documentation from the provider to suggest that there was illicit drug use or noncompliance. There were no prior urine drug screen results that indicated noncompliance, substance-abuse or other inappropriate activity. Based on the above references and clinical history a urine toxicology screen is not medically necessary.

Bilateral L4-L5 transforaminal epidural steroid injections x 2 lumbar spine: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines criteria for the use of epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural injections Page(s): 47.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines, the criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) 8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. In this case, the claimant had MRI findings which showed abutment in the L4 nerve root and there was decreased sensation in this region. The claimant had persistent pain despite conservative measures. The request for the L4-L5 ESI x 2 is appropriate and medically necessary.

Interferential unit 30 day trial: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 118-120.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines IF unit Page(s): 118.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines an IF unit is not recommended as an isolated intervention. There is no quality evidence of effectiveness except in conjunction with recommended treatments, including return to work, exercise and medications, and limited evidence of improvement on those recommended treatments alone. The randomized trials that have evaluated the effectiveness of this treatment have included studies for back pain, jaw pain, soft tissue shoulder pain, cervical neck pain and post-operative knee pain. In this case, the claimant was undergoing an ESI, not returning to work at the present time and previously completed therapy. As a result, the IF unit will not be used in conjunction with the above and is not medically necessary.