

Case Number:	CM15-0083532		
Date Assigned:	05/05/2015	Date of Injury:	05/10/2012
Decision Date:	06/19/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/30/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 43-year-old man sustained an industrial injury on 5/10/2012. The mechanism of injury is not detailed. Evaluations include lumbar spine and pelvis x-rays dated 2/11/2015 and 3/25/2015 and lumbar spine MRI performed in 2012. Diagnoses include sacroiliitis, lumbar disc disorder/myelopathy, lumbago, and lumbar sprain. Treatment has included oral and topical medications, physical therapy, home exercise program, work hardening program, and surgical intervention. Physician note dated 3/25/2015 show complaints of lumbar spine pain rated 4-5/10. Recommendations include continue physical therapy, work hardening program, lumbar spine MRI, bilateral lumbosacral facet injections, and follow up to review MRI.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bilateral L5-S1 facet injections with fluoroscopic guidance & sedation: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Facet Blocks.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM states: 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. Per the ODG, facet joint injections are under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time, no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are currently not recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence based reviews, as their benefit remains controversial. Criteria for use of diagnostic blocks for facet nerve pain: 1. One set of diagnostic medial branch blocks is required with a response of 70%; 2. Limited to non-radicular cervical pain and no more than 2 levels bilaterally. 3. Documentation of failure of conservative therapy; 4. No more than 2 joint levels are injected in 1 session; 5. Diagnostic facet blocks should be performed in patients whom a surgical procedure is anticipated. The requested service is not recommended per the ACOEM or the Official Disability Guidelines. The patient has non-radicular pain with positive facet arthropathy per MRI. The patient has failed conservative therapy and therefore the request is medically necessary.