

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0035008 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 03/03/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 06/11/2001 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 04/13/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 01/27/2015 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 02/25/2015 |

### 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, Michigan, 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 62-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/11/2001. The diagnoses have included cervical spine disk bulges, thoracic spine sprain and lumbosacral spine strain. Treatment to date has included medication. According to the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 9/5/2014, the injured worker complained of worsening pain in his lower back. The pain radiated into the thoracic area of the spine. He noted radiating pain to the right foot with numbness and tingling in the right foot. The injured worker stated that he was experiencing 9/10 pain currently. He stated that medications helped reduce symptoms by approximately 60%. Exam of the cervical spine showed tenderness and spasm over the paravertebral and trapezial musculature. Exam of the lumbar spine showed tenderness to palpation over the paravertebral musculature with spasm. Authorization was requested for electromyography (EMG) and nerve conduction study (NCS) for the upper extremities, chiropractic treatment to the lumbar spine and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the lumbar spine. Last MRI of the lumbar spine was noted to be in 2003. On 1/27/2015 Utilization Review (UR) non-certified requests for electromyography (EMG) of the bilateral upper extremities, chiropractic treatment two sessions a week for eight weeks for the lumbar spine and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the lumbar spine. The Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS), American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) Guidelines and Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Electromyogram (EMG) and Nerve Conduction Velocity (NCV) of bilateral upper extremities:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 269.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, (MTUS page 303 from ACOEM guidelines), Electromyography (EMG), including H-reflex tests, may be useful to identify subtle, focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than three or four weeks. EMG has excellent ability to identify abnormalities related to disc protrusion (MTUS page 304 from ACOEM guidelines). According to MTUS guidelines, needle EMG study helps identify subtle neurological focal dysfunction in patients with neck and arm symptoms. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks (page 178). EMG is indicated to clarify nerve dysfunction in case of suspected disc herniation (page 182). EMG is useful to identify physiological insult and anatomical defect in case of neck pain (page 179). There is no documentation of peripheral nerve damage, cervical radiculopathy and entrapment neuropathy that requires electro diagnostic testing. There is no documentation of significant change in the patient condition. Therefore, the request for EMG/NCV BUE is not medically necessary.

**Chiropractic 2 times 8 to the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual therapy & manipulation.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual therapy & manipulation Page(s): 58.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, Manual therapy & manipulation: Recommended for chronic pain if caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Manual Therapy is widely used in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. The intended goal or effect of Manual Medicine is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. Manipulation is manual therapy that moves a joint beyond the physiologic range-of-motion but not beyond the anatomic range-of-motion. Based on the patient's records, there is no functional deficits documented that could not be addressed with home exercise program. In addition, prior chiropractic sessions have been completed without significant and

objective pain and functional improvement of the patient symptoms. Therefore, the request for 16 Chiropractic visits lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

**MRI of the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the indications for imaging in case of back pain, MTUS guidelines stated : Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks. However, it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management. Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures). Furthermore, and according to MTUS guidelines, MRI is the test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, fracture or tumors that may require surgery. The patient does not have any clear evidence of new lumbar nerve root compromise. There is no clear evidence of significant change in the patient signs or symptoms suggestive of new pathology. Therefore, the request for lumbar MRI is not medically necessary.