

Case Number:	CM15-0059289		
Date Assigned:	04/03/2015	Date of Injury:	12/10/2014
Decision Date:	06/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/30/2015

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: California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 58 year old male patient who sustained an industrial injury on 12/10/2014. A primary treating office visit dated 12/31/2014 reported the patient diagnosed with lumbar strain/sprain, and sacral strain/sprain. The pan of care involved: prescriptions for: Flexeril, Naproxen, Protonix, and Vicodin. The physician is recommending hot/cold therapy along with electrical stimulation therapy. He is to return to modified work duty. A more recent office visit dated 03/10/2015 reported the patient with subjective complaints of lumbosacral back pain that becomes aggravated with activity of daily living. The plan of care noted recommending a magnetic resonance imaging be performed; along with the recommendation for in-home laser therapy, and continue with medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): Chapter 12- Low Back Complaints, Imaging, pages 303-304.

Decision rationale: Per ACOEM Treatment Guidelines for the Lower Back Disorders, under Special Studies and Diagnostic and Treatment Considerations, states Criteria for ordering imaging studies, include Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electrodiagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication for MRI of the Lumbar spine nor document any specific clinical findings to support this imaging study as the patient is without specific dermatomal or myotomal neurological deficits. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MRI of lumbar spine is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Chiro-Physio 1-3 x a week for 3 weeks for the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, pages 98-99.

Decision rationale: MTUS Guidelines supports chiropractic manipulation/ physiotherapy for musculoskeletal injury. The intended goal is the achievement of positive musculoskeletal conditions via positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. From records review, it is unclear how many sessions have been completed. Per medicals reviewed, the patient has received chiropractic physiotherapy sessions for the chronic symptom complaints without demonstrated functional improvement from treatment already rendered including milestones of increased ROM, strength, and functional capacity. There is no evidence documenting functional baseline with clear goals to be reached and the patient striving to reach those goals. The Chronic Pain Guidelines allow for visits of chiropractic / physiotherapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It appears the employee has received therapy sessions without demonstrated evidence of functional improvement to allow for additional therapy treatments. There is no report of acute flare-up, new injuries, or change in symptom or clinical findings to support for formal PT in a patient that has been instructed on a home exercise program for this injury. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support further chiropractic physiotherapy when prior treatment rendered has not resulted in any functional benefit. The Chiro-Physio 1-3 x a week for 3 weeks for the lumbar spine is not medically necessary and appropriate.

