

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0080062		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/01/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/05/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/09/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/27/2015

### 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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 57 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/05/2007 secondary to a fall. On provider visit dated 03/10/2015 the injured worker has reported low back pain, as well as significant left-sided more than right hip pain with radiation of left leg laterally into the calf, bilateral knee and ankle pain. On examination the lumbar spine was noted to have pain on palpation. The diagnoses have included status post L3-4 extreme lateral interbody fusion posterior decompression fusion and fixation from L3-L4 and previous anterior and posterior L4-5 fusion, with recurrent left leg pain and low back pain. Treatment to date has included x-rays, laboratory studies, electrocardiogram, MRI, CT scan and medication. The provider requested Bilateral L5-S1 facet blocks and Aqua physical therapy 2x4.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Bilateral L5-S1 facet blocks:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural steroid injections (ESIs) Page(s): 46. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Facet joint diagnostic blocks (injections) and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines MD Guidelines, Facet Joint Injections/Therapeutic Facet Joint Injections.

**Decision rationale:** ACOEM Guidelines state "Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain." MTUS is silent specifically with regards to facet injections, but does refer to epidural steroid injections. ODG and MD Guidelines agree that: "One diagnostic facet joint injection may be recommended for patients with chronic low back pain that is significantly exacerbated by extension and rotation or associated with lumbar rigidity and not alleviated with other conservative treatments (e.g., NSAIDs, aerobic exercise, other exercise, manipulation) in order to determine whether specific interventions targeting the facet joint are recommended. If after the initial block/blocks are given (see 'Diagnostic Phase' above) and found to produce pain relief of at least 50-70% pain relief for at least 6-8 weeks, additional blocks may be supported." ODG details additional guidelines: Clinical presentation should be consistent with facet joint pain, signs & symptoms. 1. One set of diagnostic medial branch blocks is required with a response of 70%. The pain response should last at least 2 hours for Lidocaine. 2. Limited to patients with low-back pain that is non-radicular and at no more than two levels bilaterally. 3. There is documentation of failure of conservative treatment (including home exercise, PT and NSAIDs) prior to the procedure for at least 4-6 weeks. 4. No more than 2 facet joint levels are injected in one session (see above for medial branch block levels). 5. Recommended volume of no more than 0.5 cc of injectate is given to each joint. 6. No pain medication from home should be taken for at least 4 hours prior to the diagnostic block and for 4 to 6 hours afterward. 7. Opioids should not be given as a "sedative" during the procedure. 8. The use of IV sedation (including other agents such as midazolam) may be grounds to negate the results of a diagnostic block, and should only be given in cases of extreme anxiety. 9. The patient should document pain relief with an instrument such as a VAS scale, emphasizing the importance of recording the maximum pain relief and maximum duration of pain. The patient should also keep medication use and activity logs to support subjective reports of better pain control. 10. Diagnostic facet blocks should not be performed in patients in whom a surgical procedure is anticipated. (Resnick, 2005) 11. Diagnostic facet blocks should not be performed in patients who have had a previous fusion procedure at the planned injection level. [Exclusion Criteria that would require UR physician review: Previous fusion at the targeted level. The medical documentation provided indicate this patient has symptoms of radiculopathy, guidelines recommend against this treatment with radicular symptoms. Medical documents do not include the results of conservative treatment. As such, the request for Bilateral L5-S1 facet blocks is not medically necessary.

**Aqua physical therapy 2x4:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 22.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic Therapy and Physical Medicine Page(s): 22, 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Aquatic Therapy and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines MD Guidelines, Aquatic Therapy.

**Decision rationale:** California MTUS guidelines state that "Aquatic therapy (including swimming) can minimize the effects of gravity, so it is specifically recommended where reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity." MD Guidelines similarly states, "If the patient has subacute or chronic LBP and meets criteria for a referral for supervised exercise therapy and has co-morbidities (e.g., extreme obesity, significant degenerative joint disease, etc.) that preclude effective participation in a weight-bearing physical activity, then a trial of aquatic therapy is recommended for the treatment of subacute or chronic LBP." Regarding the number of visits, MTUS states "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." ODG states "Patients should be formally assessed after a "six-visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted." At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. The medical documents provided do not indicate any concerns that patient was extremely obese. Additionally, the medical records do not indicate that objective findings of functional improvement from the previous aquatic therapy, which is needed to extend and continue additional therapy. As such, the current request Aqua physical therapy 2x4 is not medically necessary at this time.