

Case Number:	CM15-0167396		
Date Assigned:	09/08/2015	Date of Injury:	09/26/2014
Decision Date:	10/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/25/2015

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 43 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9-26-14. He reported pain in his lower back, left shoulder and left side after a 23 foot fall. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left shoulder injury with labral tear, left wrist contusion, left ulnar nerve contusion and left knee pain. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, a left shoulder MRI, a left wrist MRI and an EMG-NCS study of the left arm. Current medications include Flector patch and Ibuprofen. On 6-1-15 the injured worker rated his left shoulder, left wrist and left knee pain a 5 out of 10 and was not taking any medications. There was no physical examination of the lumbar spine. By 7-13-15 the injured worker was experiencing symptoms in his neck, back and headaches. These symptoms had been documented by the treating physician earlier in the year. There was no physical examination of the lumbar spine. As of the PR2 dated 7-29-15, the injured worker reports continued pain in his left shoulder, left wrist and left knee and no new complaints. He rates his pain an 8 out of 10. Objective findings include spinal range of motion is not full and hindered secondary to pain and tenderness to palpation in the back at midline and paraspinal. The treating physician requested a lumbar MRI without contrast.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the lumbar spine without contrast: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: 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. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Relying solely on imaging studies to evaluate the source of low back and related symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. Techniques vary in their abilities to define abnormalities (Table 12-7). Imaging studies should be reserved for cases in which surgery is considered or red-flag diagnoses are being evaluated. Because the overall false-positive rate is 30% for imaging studies in patients over age 30 who do not have symptoms, the risk of diagnostic confusion is great. There is no recorded presence of emerging red flags on the physical exam. There is evidence of nerve compromise on physical exam but there is not mention of consideration for surgery or complete failure of conservative therapy. For these reasons, criteria for imaging as defined above per the ACOEM have not been met. Therefore the request is not certified and therefore is not medically necessary.