

Case Number:	CM15-0085594		
Date Assigned:	05/12/2015	Date of Injury:	09/03/2009
Decision Date:	06/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/04/2015

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 York

Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurological Surgery

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 50 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/3/09. The injured worker has complaints of low back pain associated with numbness and tingling sensation in the bilateral legs. The documentation noted on the physical exam finding and neurological examination findings all correlate specifically with the radiographs and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) findings. The diagnoses have included displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy. Treatment to date has included physical therapy; computerized tomography (CT) scan of the lumbar spine on 3/2/15; magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the lumbar spine; fusion in May 2011; magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) on 3/2/15 revealed a small disc protrusion at L3-L4 approximately 2 millimeters; status post removal of hardware and posterolateral fusion at L4-L5 and L5-S1 (sacroiliac) with subsequent wound dehiscence on 1/29/14; home exercise program and Norco as needed for pain. The request was for anterior and posterior decompression at L3-L4; fusion at L3-4; associated surgical service, assistant surgeon, vascular surgeon, internal medicine clearance; post-operative physical therapy #24; associated surgical service for off the shelf lumbar brace, front wheeled walker, 3 in 1 commode, hospital bed times 30 days, bone growth stimulator times 9 months, home health evaluation, transportation and in-patient hospital stay times two days and Norco 10/325mg #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Anterior and posterior decompression at L3-L4: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 305.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): s 305-307.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS guidelines recommend surgery when the patient has had severe persistent, debilitating extremity complaints referable to a specific nerve root or spinal cord level corroborated by clear imaging, clinical examination and electrophysiological studies. Documentation does not provide such evidence. The guidelines note the patient would have failed a trial of conservative therapy. The guidelines note the surgical repair proposed for the lesion must have evidence of efficacy both in the short and long term. The requested treatment: Anterior and posterior decompression at L3-L4 is NOT Medically necessary and appropriate.

Fusion at L3-L4: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 307.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): s 305-307.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS guidelines do recommend a spinal fusion for traumatic vertebral fracture, dislocation and instability. This patient has not had any of these events. The provider states that there is observed instability at L3-4, but documentation does not provide evidence of this. The guidelines note that the efficacy of fusion in the absence of instability has not been proven. The requested treatment: Fusion at L3-L4 is are NOT Medically necessary and appropriate.

Assistant surgeon: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Vascular surgeon: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Internal medicine clearance: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Post-op physical therapy #24: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Off the shelf lumbar brace: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Front wheel walker: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: 3 in 1 Commode: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Hospital bed x 30 days: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Bone growth stimulator x 9 months: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Home health evaluation: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Transportation: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Associated surgical service: Inpatient hospital stay x 2 days: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.