

Case Number:	CM15-0039343		
Date Assigned:	03/09/2015	Date of Injury:	09/24/2012
Decision Date:	04/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/02/2015

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: Massachusetts

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 43 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 09/24/2012. He has reported subsequent neck and left elbow pain and headaches and was diagnosed with post-traumatic daily headaches, chronic myofascial pain syndrome of the cervical spine and mild left ulnar nerve entrapment at the left elbow. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication, physical therapy, acupuncture and aqua therapy. In a progress note dated 01/08/2015, the injured worker complained of continued severe head and neck pain that was rated as 9/10. Objective findings were notable for tenderness to palpation of the cervical spine bilaterally with increased muscle rigidity, numerous palpable and tender trigger points throughout the cervical paraspinal muscles and decreased range of motion with obvious muscle guarding. The physician noted that cervical epidural injections were warranted as the injured worker continued to complain of debilitating neck pain with radicular symptoms that correlated with abnormal physical examination findings.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

C5-6 ESI under fluoro outpatient: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines ESIs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit; 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007). 8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. MRI dated 3/10/15 fails to indicate neural impingement and therefore does not corroborate the physical exam findings. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.