

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0164244		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/10/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/25/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/30/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/14/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/20/2015

### 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: New York, Montana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurological 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 32-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on October 25, 2012. The worker was employed as a farm laborer. The accident was described as having slipped, fallen with resulting injury. A neurological follow up dated July 31, 2015 reported subjective complaint of pain and discomfort, difficulty sleeping, sexual dysfunction and headaches. He continues as temporarily totally disabled. Recent magnetic resonance imaging study done on April 05, 2015 revealed L5-S1 discogenic change with midline protrusion and annular fissuring with moderate narrowing of the neural foraminal outlet. He is utilizing Gabapentin and Motrin. He was diagnosed with having right sided lumbar radiculopathy. An orthopedic visit dated July 30, 2014 reported subjective complaint of ongoing low back pain. There is noted discussion stating he has reached maximum medical improvement as his low back strain has resolved and objective assessment is normal. A recent primary treating office visit dated August 06, 2015 reported subjective complaint of low back pain to bilateral lumbar region radiating down the lower extremities. Previous treatment modalities to include: assistive devices, activity modification, medications, chiropractic care, heat application, injections, home exercises, physical therapy session and nerve stimulation. The following diagnoses were applied: lumbar degenerative disc disease, and sciatica. The plan of care is with recommendation for surgical intervention in the form of a L5-S1 disc replacement involving the following: assistant surgeon, pre-operative work up and clearance and post-operative physical therapy course.

## IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**L5-S1 anterior disc replacement:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Surgical Considerations. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low back chapter-Disc prosthesis.

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS guidelines recommend lumbar surgery if there are severe persistent, debilitating lower extremity complaints, clear clinical and imaging evidence of a specific lesion corresponding to a nerve root or spinal cord level, corroborated by electrophysiological studies, which is known to respond to surgical repair both in the near and long term. Documentation does not provide this evidence. The provider has recommended a lumbar disc replacement but evidence is not provided as to why this operation is required by the patient. The ODG does not recommend artificial disc replacement. The requested treatment is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Anterior assistant surgeon:** 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.

**Preoperative lab: 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.

**Preoperative lab: Chemistry:** 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.

**Preoperative lab: Urinalysis:** 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.

**Preoperative lab: 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.

**Preoperative lab: 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.

**Preoperative lab: 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.

**Two day inpatient hospital stay: 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.

**Preoperative physical therapy evaluation: 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: Twelve physical therapy visits: 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.