

Case Number:	CM15-0033502		
Date Assigned:	03/17/2015	Date of Injury:	06/06/2003
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/23/2015

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: Ohio, West Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Medical Toxicology

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 49 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 6, 2003. He reported injury to the back and left leg. The injured worker was diagnosed as having discogenic lumbar condition with facet inflammation and right-sided radiculopathy and status post anterior lumbar interbody fusion on March 29, 2010. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, surgery and medications. On February 2, 2015, the injured worker complained of constant pain with numbness and tingling in the leg. Physical examination revealed lumbar flexion 30 degrees, extension 20 degrees and lateral tilting 10 degrees bilaterally with discomfort on the right. There was pain on facet loading at L3 through S1 on the right. Straight leg raise was positive on the right and negative on the left. Notes stated that he had not gone to any chiropractic visits. The treatment plan included pain management medications, back brace and blood testing.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Referral to a spine surgeon: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 310.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 296. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Office Visit.

Decision rationale: ODG states concerning office visits; "Recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment." ACOEM additionally states concerning low back complaints: "Assessing Red Flags and Indications for Immediate Referral Physical-examination evidence of severe neurologic compromise that correlates with the medical history and test results may indicate a need for immediate consultation. The examination may further reinforce or reduce suspicions of tumor, infection, fracture, or dislocation. A history of tumor, infection, abdominal aneurysm, or other related serious conditions, together with positive findings on examination, warrants further investigation or referral. A medical history that suggests pathology originating somewhere other than in the lumbosacral area may warrant examination of the knee, hip, abdomen, pelvis or other areas." Medical records to no indicate any red flags for immediate for immediate referral. Objective findings post time of most recent complaint/exacerbation notes pain and movement restriction but the limited neuro examination had normal findings. This IW had been maintained effectively with conservative treatment for a number of years, there is no indication that conservative treatment would not again be appropriate. As such, the request for surgical referral is deemed not medically necessary at this time.

Repeat MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low back- Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: MTUS and ACOEM are silent specifically regarding repeating MRIs for lumbar spine. ACOEM does recommend MRI, in general, for low back pain when "cauda equine, tumor, infection, or fracture are strongly suspected and plain film radiographs are negative, MRI test of choice for patients with prior back surgery." ACOEM additionally recommends against MRI for low back pain "before 1 month in absence of red flags." ODG states, "Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology (eg, tumor, infection, fracture, neurocompression, recurrent disc herniation)." "Imaging is indicated only if they have severe progressive neurologic impairments or signs or symptoms indicating a serious or specific underlying condition, or if they are candidates for invasive interventions. Immediate imaging is recommended for patients with major risk factors for cancer, spinal infection, cauda equina

syndrome, or severe or progressive neurologic deficits. Imaging after a trial of treatment is recommended for patients who have minor risk factors for cancer, inflammatory back disease, vertebral compression fracture, radiculopathy, or symptomatic spinal stenosis. Subsequent imaging should be based on new symptoms or changes in current symptoms." The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam or objective testing) any red flags, or other findings suggestive of significant new pathologies. As such, the request for repeat MRI of lumbar spine is deemed not medical necessary.