

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0010309		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	01/27/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/09/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/17/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	12/23/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/19/2015

### 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 39 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 05/09/2013. Medical records provided by the treating physician did not indicate the injured worker's mechanism of injury. The injured worker was diagnosed with lumbago, myalgia and myositis not otherwise specified, and depressive disorder not elsewhere classified. Treatment to date has included an oral medication regimen, pain psychotherapy, use of ice and heat, and exercise. Currently, the injured worker complains of aching, burning, sharp low back pain that radiates to the right thigh. The treating physician requested right side medial branch block of the lumbar spine at lumbar two to lumbar five noting the injured worker to have complaints of axial pain and tenderness to palpation in the paravertebral areas. On 12/23/2014 Utilization Review non-certified the request for right side medial branch block of the lumbar spine at lumbar two to lumbar five, noting the California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule 2009, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Occupation Medical Practice Guidelines, Second Edition 2004, Chapter Low Back Complaints, page 301.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Right Side Medial Branch Block Lumbar L2-L5:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Treatment Index, 11th Edition (web), 2013, Low Back, facet joint diagnostic blocks (injections)

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 309.

**Decision rationale:** According MTUS guidelines, “Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain”. According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, “Under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003) (Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti , 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial”. Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, Criteria for use of therapeutic intra-articular and medial branch blocks, are as follows: 1. No more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is recommended. 2. There should be no evidence of radicular pain, spinal stenosis, or previous fusion. 3. If successful (initial pain relief of 70%, plus pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). 4. No more than 2 joint levels may be blocked at any one time. 5. There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. In this case, there is no documentation of facet mediated pain; there is no clear evidence or documentation that L2-5 facets are main pain generator. There is no evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. MTUS guidelines do not recommend more than 2 joint levels to be blocked at any one time. Therefore, the request for 1 Medial Branch Block for Levels L2, L3, L4 & L5 of right Lumbar Spine is not medically necessary.