

Case Number:	CM15-0030401		
Date Assigned:	02/24/2015	Date of Injury:	02/15/2002
Decision Date:	05/19/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/18/2015

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 Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 male, who sustained an industrial injury on February 15, 2002. The injured worker's initial complaints and diagnoses are not included in the provided documentation. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbago and neuropathy of the scrotum and feet. Diagnostic studies are not addressed. Treatment to date has included short-acting and long acting opioids, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory and anti-epilepsy medications. On December 30, 2014, the injured worker complains of back and neuropathic pain in the scrotum and feet. The physical exam revealed a cane, tenderness in the lumbar spine, and burning sensation in the scrotum and dorsum of the feet. The treatment plan includes diagnostic lumbar spine facet injections to lumbar 3-4, lumbar 4-5, and lumbar 5-sacral 1 with fluoroscopy and bilateral sacroiliac joint injections. The requested treatments L3-4, L4-5, L5-S1 diagnostic facet injections with conscious sedation under fluoroscopy and bilateral sacroiliac joint injections.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Injection: L3-4, L4-5, L5-S1: Diagnostic Facet Injections with conscious sedation under fluoroscopy: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Low Back Chapter; Facet joint pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 309.

Decision rationale: According MTUS guidelines, "Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain". According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, "Under study, current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003) (Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti, 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial". Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, "Criteria for use of therapeutic intra-articular and medial branch blocks, are as follows: 1. No more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is recommended. 2. There should be no evidence of radicular pain, spinal stenosis, or previous fusion. 3. If successful (initial pain relief of 70%, plus pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). 4. No more than 2 joint levels may be blocked at any one time. 5. There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. The ODG guidelines did not support facet injection for lumbar pain in this clinical context. There is no documentation of facet mediated pain or that facets are the main pain generator. The patient have evidence of radiculopathy and ODG guidelines do not recommend facet injections in case of radiculopathy. There is no documentation of failure of conservative therapies in this patient. Therefore, the request for Injection: L3-4, L4-5, L5-S1: Diagnostic Facet Injections with conscious sedation under fluoroscopy is not medically necessary.

Bilateral Sacroiliac Joint Injections: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Sacroiliac injections.

Decision rationale: MTUS guidelines are silent regarding sacroiliac injections. According to ODG guidelines, sacroiliac injections are medically necessary if the patient fulfills the following criteria: 1.the history and physical examination should suggest the diagnosis; 2. Other pain generators should be excluded; 3. Documentation of failure of 4-6 weeks aggressive therapies; 4. Blocks are performed under fluoroscopy; 5. Documentation of 80% pain relief for a diagnostic block; 6. If steroids are injected during the initial injection, the duration of relief should be at least 6 weeks; 7. In the therapeutic phase, the interval between 2 block is at least 2 months; 8. The block is not performed at the same day as an epidural injection; 9. The therapeutic procedure should be repeated as needed with no more than 4 procedures per year. It is not clear from the patient file, that the patient fulfills the criteria of sacroiliac damage, that the sacroiliac joint is the pain generator and other pain generator have been excluded. Therefore, the requested for Bilateral Sacroiliac Joint Injections is not medically necessary.