

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0024924		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/28/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/26/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/28/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/09/2015

### 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 52 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 4/28/10. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back. The diagnoses included degeneration of lumbosacral intervertebral disc, chronic low back pain, lumbosacral radiculitis, chronic pain syndrome, radiculitis, sprain of shoulder and upper arm and lumbar sprain. Treatments to date include oral pain medication. In a progress note dated 11/10/14 the treating provider reports the injured worker was with "tenderness noted over paraspinal muscles overlying the facet joints and sacroiliac joints, trigger points noted over lower paraspinal. On 1/28/15 Utilization Review non-certified the request for magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine. The MTUS, ACOEM Guidelines, (or ODG) was cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI Lumbar Spine:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back -Lumbar &Thoracic/ MRI

**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 imaging studies states: Table 12-7 provides a general comparison of the abilities of different techniques to identify physiologic insult and define anatomic defects. An imaging study may be appropriate for a patient whose limitations due to consistent symptoms have persisted for one month or more to further evaluate the possibility of potentially serious pathology, such as a tumor. 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. Per the ACOEM, imaging studies are indicated in the presence of red flag symptoms, when suspected cauda equina syndrome, tumor or fracture are strongly suspected or when surgery is being considered. There is no documentation of any of these criteria. However there is documentaiton of acute changes in the patient's physical exam as noted by marked increase in radicular symptoms. The physical exam notes positive neurologic deficits. Therefore the request is medically warranted.