

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0149278		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/12/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/16/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/29/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/17/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/31/2015

### 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: 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 50 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 12-16-2014, due to collapse of a ladder. The injured worker was diagnosed as having spinal stenosis. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, physical therapy, chiropractic, lumbar epidural steroid injection L4-5 on 4-29-2015, and medications. Currently, 7/13/15, the injured worker complains of back pain and leg pain. Range of motion was limited due to pain. Muscle spasms were noted and straight leg raise test was positive. Symptoms to the lower extremities included pain, burning sensation, and numbness. Medication use included Flexeril and Ibuprofen. The treatment plan included a lumbar spine lateral lumbar interbody fusion (XLIF) laminectomy L4-5, pre-operative labs, urinalysis, EKG, x-ray, cold therapy unit with pad, and crutches. Work status was total temporary disability. Magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine (report not submitted) was documented as showing a central disc protrusion at L4-5 with some mild stenosis.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lumbar spine XLIF laminectomy L4-5: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 305-307. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, XLIF (extreme lateral interbody fusion).

**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, fusion.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM Guidelines Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints page 307 state that lumbar fusion, except for cases of trauma-related spinal fracture or dislocation, fusion of the spine 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 symptom. 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 note of 7/13/15 to warrant fusion. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary for lumbar fusion.

**Associated surgical service: Pre-operative workup labs:** 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.

**Associated surgical service: 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.

**Associated surgical service: 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.

**Associated surgical service: 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.

**Associated surgical service: Cold therapy unit with pad: 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.

**Associated surgical service: crutches: 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.