

Case Number:	CM15-0139674		
Date Assigned:	08/03/2015	Date of Injury:	11/15/1986
Decision Date:	09/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/20/2015

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, Indiana, Oregon
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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 60-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11-15-1986. The mechanism of injury was from picking up a pallet. The injured worker was diagnosed as having anterior cervical discectomy and fusion 20 years prior, L4-5 spondylolisthesis, thoracolumbar scoliosis, lumbar degenerative disc disease and lumbar spinal stenosis. Lumbar magnetic resonance imaging showed discogenic disease with anterolisthesis on L4-5 with mild disc bulges at L3-4, 4-5 and L5-S1. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, injections and medication management. In a progress note dated 6-1-2015, the injured worker complains of worsening lumbar and lower leg pain, rated 9 out of 10. Physical examination showed lumbar paraspinal tenderness. The treating physician is requesting Right L3-S1 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion, T9-S1 posterior spinal fusion with instrumentation, L2-L5 laminectomy, application of intervertebral biomechanical device, preoperative clearance: urinalysis, CBC, CMP, electrocardiogram, chest x ray and PT/PTT and preoperative clearance with an internal medicine doctor.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right L3-S1 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 307. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM Guidelines Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints page 307 states that lumbar fusion, except for cases of trauma-related spinal fracture or dislocation, is not usually considered during the first three months of symptoms. Patients with increased spinal instability (not work-related) after surgical decompression at the level of degenerative spondylolisthesis may be candidates for fusion. According to the ODG, Low back, Fusion (spinal) should be considered for 6 months of symptoms. Indications for fusion include neural arch defect, segmental instability with movement of more than 4.5 mm, revision surgery where functional gains are anticipated, infection, tumor, deformity and after a third disc herniation. In addition, ODG states, there is a lack of support for fusion for mechanical low back pain for subjects with failure to participate effectively in active rehab pre-op, total disability over 6 months, active psych diagnosis, and narcotic dependence. In this particular patient, there is lack of medical necessity for lumbar fusion, as there is no evidence of segmental instability greater than 4.5 mm, severe stenosis or psychiatric clearance from the exam notes to warrant fusion. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

T9-S1 posterior spinal fusion with instrumentation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 307. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM Guidelines Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints page 307 states that lumbar fusion, except for cases of trauma-related spinal fracture or dislocation, is not usually considered during the first three months of symptoms. Patients with increased spinal instability (not work-related) after surgical decompression at the level of degenerative spondylolisthesis may be candidates for fusion. According to the ODG, Low back, Fusion (spinal) should be considered for 6 months of symptoms. Indications for fusion include neural arch defect, segmental instability with movement of more than 4.5 mm, revision surgery where functional gains are anticipated, infection, tumor, deformity and after a third disc herniation. In addition, ODG states, there is a lack of support for fusion for mechanical low back pain for subjects with failure to participate effectively in active rehab pre-op, total disability over 6 months, active psych diagnosis, and narcotic dependence. In this particular patient, there is lack of medical necessity for lumbar fusion, as there is no evidence of segmental instability greater than 4.5 mm, severe stenosis or psychiatric clearance from the exam notes to warrant fusion. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

L2-L5 laminectomy, application of intervertebral biomechanical device: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on dynamic, non-fusion lumbar interspinous implants. The ODG low back is referenced. Dynamic stabilization is not recommended for non-specific low back pain. There may be a role for spinal stenosis treatment in the elderly where fusion is an untenable option. There is limited support for the notion that semi-rigid fixation yields better patient specific results than fusion. Long-term follow up studies are pending before the concept can be recommended. As the requested procedure lacks long clinical outcome data, the request is not medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance: UA: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance: PT/PTT: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance: CBC: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance: CMP: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance: EKG: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance: Chest x-ray: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-op clearance with internal medicine doctor: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.