

Case Number:	CM15-0089658		
Date Assigned:	05/14/2015	Date of Injury:	11/12/2012
Decision Date:	06/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/11/2015

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: Arizona, California
 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:

The injured worker is a 63 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/12/2012. He reported injury from a motor vehicle accident. The injured worker was diagnosed as having chronic persistent axial neck pain. Cervical x rays showed no instability and a cervical magnetic resonance imaging showed mild annular disc bulge and stenosis and multiple levels. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, spinal decompression therapy, steroid injections and medication management. In a progress note dated 4/9/2015, the injured worker complains of neck pain and numbness, tingling and weakness of the left hand. The treating physician is requesting cervical 7-thoracic 1 epidural steroid injection.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

C7-T1 Translaminar epidural steroid injection: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines criteria for the use of epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural injections Page(s): 47.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines, the criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using trans-foraminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007)8) Current research does not support a 'series-of-three' injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. In this case, the claimant had previous findings of canal stenosis on MRI of C6-7. There was noted numbness in the left hand. The claimant did receive epidural injections in 2010 with relief. Although, the ESI may be beneficial for the C6-C7 level, the request for C7-T1 is not justified on clinical or diagnostic findings. The request for an ESI of C7-T1 is not medically necessary.