

Case Number:	CM15-0198465		
Date Assigned:	10/15/2015	Date of Injury:	10/28/2013
Decision Date:	12/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/08/2015

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, California
 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 43 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10-28-13. The injured worker was diagnosed as having displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc and disc degeneration. Subjective findings (7-20-15, 9-2-15, 9-21-15) indicated 7-9 out of 10 pain in the lower back. She is not currently working. Objective findings (6-17-15, 7-20-15, 9-2-15, 9-21-15) revealed good strength and sensation in the bilateral lower extremities. There is full range of motion in the lumbar spine and a negative straight leg raise test bilaterally. As of the PR2 dated 10-2-15, the injured worker reports left and axial back pain and leg pain. Objective findings include motor and sensory examination of the upper and lower extremities are normal, normal reflexes and normal gait. Treatment to date has included a bilateral L3, L4 and L5 branch block on 10-17-14, a left L3, L4 and L5 rhizotomy on 1-23-15 with 60 percent improvement, physical therapy, a lumbar MRI on 8-19-15 showing a small posterior disc protrusion at L4-L5 and L5-S1, Norco, Gabapentin, Flexeril, and NSAIDs. The Utilization Review dated 10-7-15, non-certified the request for an L5-S1 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion, associated services, pot-op physical therapy evaluation-treatment x 1, post-op Norco, post-op Gabapentin, post-op Soma, post-op NSAIDs, a lumbar X-ray and acupuncture 2 x weekly for 6 weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

L5-S1 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion (TLIF): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Surgical Considerations.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Surgical Considerations.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines do recommend spinal fusion for fracture, dislocation and instability. Documentation does not provide evidence of these conditions. No radiographic evidence of instability is provided, nor a severe radiculopathy. The requested treatment: L5-S1 Transforaminal Lumbar Interbody Fusion (TLIF) is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated surgical service: Hospital Stay 2-5 days: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Pre-op Labs: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Pre-op Labs: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Pre-op Labs: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Pre-op Labs: BMP: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Pre-op Labs: Electrolyte panel: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated surgical service: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Post-op Physical Therapy evaluation/treatment x 1: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated surgical service: Therapeutic Exercises 2-3 times a week for 6 weeks: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Post-op Norco (quantity and dosage unspecified): 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Post-op Gabapentin (quantity and dosage unspecified): 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Post-op Soma (quantity and dosage unspecified): 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Post-op NSAIDS (quantity and dosage unspecified): 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

X-ray Lumbar: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Acupuncture 2 times a week for 6 weeks: 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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.