

Case Number:	CM15-0219173		
Date Assigned:	11/12/2015	Date of Injury:	03/21/2014
Decision Date:	12/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/06/2015

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, Oregon, Washington
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 59 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 3-21-2014. A review of medical records indicates the injured worker is being treated for disc degeneration L5-S1, facet arthropathy L5-S1, left sacroiliac joint dysfunction. Medical records dated 8-18-2015 noted ongoing left sided back and buttocks pain, worse with sitting. She had occasional pain in the left posterior thigh. Pain was rated 7 out of 10 on VAS and 4 out of 10 with medications. Physical examination was not noted. Treatment has included Anaprox and tramadol since at least 4-13-2015. Utilization review form dated 10-15-2015 noncertified Left L4-5 radiofrequency ablation and left L5-S1 radiofrequency ablation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left L4-L5 radio frequency ablation Qty: 1: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy. According to the ODG, Low Back, Facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy, criteria includes a formal plan of additional evidence-based conservative care in addition to facet joint therapy. There is insufficient evidence in the records from 8/18/15 demonstrating this formal plan has been contemplated or initiated. Per ODG: "Under study. Conflicting evidence is available as to the efficacy of this procedure and approval of treatment should be made on a case-by-case basis (only 3 RCTs with one suggesting pain benefit without functional gains, potential benefit if used to reduce narcotics). Studies have not demonstrated improved function. Also called Facet rhizotomy, Radiofrequency medial branch neurotomy, or Radiofrequency ablation (RFA), this is a type of injection procedure in which a heat lesion is created on specific nerves to interrupt pain signals to the brain, with a medial branch neurotomy affecting the nerves carrying pain from the facet joints." The guidelines continue to state: Criteria for use of facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy: (1) Treatment requires a diagnosis of facet joint pain using a medial branch block as described above. See Facet joint diagnostic blocks (injections). (2) While repeat neurotomies may be required, they should not occur at an interval of less than 6 months from the first procedure. A neurotomy should not be repeated unless duration of relief from the first procedure is documented for at least 12 weeks at 50% relief. The current literature does not support that the procedure is successful without sustained pain relief (generally of at least 6 months duration). No more than 3 procedures should be performed in a year's period. (3) Approval of repeat neurotomies depends on variables such as evidence of adequate diagnostic blocks, documented improvement in VAS score, decreased medications and documented improvement in function. (4) No more than two joint levels are to be performed at one time. (5) If different regions require neural blockade, these should be performed at intervals of no sooner than one week, and preferably 2 weeks for most blocks. (6) There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based conservative care in addition to facet joint therapy. In this case the patient does not meet ODG criteria for facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy because there is no evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based conservative care in addition to facet joint therapy. Therefore procedure is not medically necessary and the determination is for non-certification. Therefore, the requested treatment is not medically necessary.

Left L5-S1 radio frequency ablation Qty: 1: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy. According to the ODG, Low Back, Facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy, criteria includes a formal plan of additional evidence-based conservative care in addition to facet joint

therapy. There is insufficient evidence in the records from 8/18/15 demonstrating this formal plan has been contemplated or initiated. Per ODG: "Under study. Conflicting evidence is available as to the efficacy of this procedure and approval of treatment should be made on a case-by-case basis (only 3 RCTs with one suggesting pain benefit without functional gains, potential benefit if used to reduce narcotics). Studies have not demonstrated improved function. Also called Facet rhizotomy, Radiofrequency medial branch neurotomy, or Radiofrequency ablation (RFA), this is a type of injection procedure in which a heat lesion is created on specific nerves to interrupt pain signals to the brain, with a medial branch neurotomy affecting the nerves carrying pain from the facet joints." The guidelines continue to state: Criteria for use of facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy: (1) Treatment requires a diagnosis of facet joint pain using a medial branch block as described above. See Facet joint diagnostic blocks (injections). (2) While repeat neurotomies may be required, they should not occur at an interval of less than 6 months from the first procedure. A neurotomy should not be repeated unless duration of relief from the first procedure is documented for at least 12 weeks at 50% relief. The current literature does not support that the procedure is successful without sustained pain relief (generally of at least 6 months duration). No more than 3 procedures should be performed in a year's period. (3) Approval of repeat neurotomies depends on variables such as evidence of adequate diagnostic blocks, documented improvement in VAS score, decreased medications and documented improvement in function. (4) No more than two joint levels are to be performed at one time. (5) If different regions require neural blockade, these should be performed at intervals of no sooner than one week, and preferably 2 weeks for most blocks. (6) There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based conservative care in addition to facet joint therapy. In this case the patient does not meet ODG criteria for facet joint radiofrequency neurotomy because there is no evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based conservative care in addition to facet joint therapy. Therefore procedure is not medically necessary and the determination is for non-certification. Therefore, the requested treatment is not medically necessary.