

Case Number:	CM15-0135138		
Date Assigned:	07/23/2015	Date of Injury:	07/11/2002
Decision Date:	08/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/13/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 68-year-old male with an industrial injury dated 07/11/2002. The injured worker's diagnoses include cervical discopathy with disc displacement, cervical radiculopathy, and lumbar discopathy with disc displacement, lumbar radiculopathy and bilateral sacroiliac (SI) arthropathy. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 05/30/2015, the injured worker reported pain in the cervical and lumbar spine. Objective findings revealed tenderness to palpitation with decrease range of motion in the cervical and lumbar spine, tenderness to palpitation at bilateral sacroiliac (SI) joints, positive Spurling's sign, positive FABER, and positive Patrick's maneuver. The treatment plan consisted of medication management, lumbar orthosis, urine toxicology test and follow up appointment. The treating physician requested one lumbar orthosis for support, now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 lumbar orthosis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Lumbar Supports.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for lumbosacral orthosis, ACOEM guidelines state that lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. ODG states that lumbar supports are not recommended for prevention. They go on to state the lumbar support are recommended as an option for compression fractures and specific treatment of spondylolisthesis, documented instability, and for treatment of nonspecific low back pain. ODG goes on to state that for nonspecific low back pain, compared to no lumbar support, elastic lumbar belt maybe more effective than no belt at improving pain at 30 and 90 days in people with subacute low back pain lasting 1 to 3 months. However, the evidence was very weak. Within the documentation available for review, it does not appear that this patient is in the acute or subacute phase of his treatment. Additionally, there is no documentation indicating that the patient has a diagnosis of compression fracture, spondylolisthesis, or instability. As such, the currently requested lumbosacral orthosis is not medically necessary.