

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0131338		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/17/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/17/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/06/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/07/2015

### 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: 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:

The injured worker is a 34-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 12/17/2012 resulting in low back pain. She is diagnosed with chronic lumbar sprain or strain. Treatment has included previous diagnostic MRI, medication, physical therapy, acupuncture, chiropractic treatments, and home exercise which were interrupted due to pregnancy, and for which no results are documented. The injured worker continues to report intermittent low back pain with occasional left leg numbness. The treating physician's plan of care includes lumbar MRI without contrast. She is presently not working.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lumbar MRI without contrast:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Neck & Upper Back, Low Back.

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

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS states that 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. Indiscriminant 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 medical record fails to document sufficient findings indicative of nerve root compromise which would warrant an MRI of the lumbar spine. Lumbar MRI without contrast is not medically necessary.