

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0046316		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/18/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/23/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/11/2015

### 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 39 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/23/2014. The current diagnoses are spinal stenosis at L5-S1 and radiculopathy. According to the progress report dated 12/1/2014, the injured worker complains of continued pain and discomfort in the low back, left worse than right, with radiation into the left leg with associated numbness in the leg. Current medication list was not available for review. Treatment to date has included medication management, MRI of the lumbar spine, physical therapy, home exercises, and bilateral L5-S1 transforaminal epidural steroid injection with nerve block at L5 (12/17/2014). The plan of care includes pain management specialist for the lumbar spine (unspecified treatment) and consultation with a pain management specialist for the lumbar spine.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Unspecified treatment with a pain management specialist, lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Chapter (ACOEM Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition (2004), Chapter 7), page 127.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs, early intervention Page(s): 32-33.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, the presence of red flags may indicate the need for specialty consultation. In addition, the requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for a pain management evaluation with a specialist. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. In the chronic pain programs, early intervention section of MTUS guidelines stated: "Recommendations for identification of patients that may benefit from early intervention via a multidisciplinary approach: (a) The patient's response to treatment falls outside of the established norms for their specific diagnosis without a physical explanation to explain symptom severity. (b) The patient exhibits excessive pain behavior and/or complaints compared to that expected from the diagnosis. (c) There is a previous medical history of delayed recovery. (d) The patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted. (e) Inadequate employer support. (f) Loss of employment for greater than 4 weeks. The most discernible indication of at risk status is lost time from work of 4 to 6 weeks. (Mayer 2003)" There is no clear documentation that the patient needs a pain management evaluation as per MTUS criteria. There is no clear documentation that the patient had delayed recovery and a response to medications that falls outside the established norm. The provider did not document the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. Therefore, the request for Pain Management consultation is not medically necessary.