

Case Number:	CM15-0233603		
Date Assigned:	12/09/2015	Date of Injury:	06/03/2015
Decision Date:	01/12/2016	UR Denial Date:	11/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/30/2015

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, Oregon, Washington
Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic 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 64 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 3, 2015, incurring upper back injuries. He was diagnosed with cervical disc disease with cervical herniation and cervical radiculopathy. Treatments included anti-inflammatory drugs, ice, 12 sessions of physical therapy and home exercise program, and activity restrictions. His symptoms were noted to improve. Currently the injured worker complained of cervical pain with limited range of motion. He complained of neck pain rated 6 out of 10 with numbness radiating to the bilateral upper extremities. He had frequent muscle spasms in his neck and upper back region. The injured worker reported constant cervical spine pain limiting his functional capacity. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included interlaminar epidural steroid injection of the cervical spine. On November 13, 2015, a request for a cervical epidural steroid injection was denied by the physician advisor.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Interlaminar epidural steroid injection targeting C5-6, C6-7: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Epidural steroid injections (ESIs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Initial Care, and Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Epidural steroid injections (ESIs).

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS/ Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Epidural Steroid injections "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. Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. There must be evidence that the claimant is unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs, and muscle relaxants)." These guidelines regarding epidural steroid injections continue to state that "there is insufficient evidence to make any recommendation for the use of epidural steroid injections to treat radicular cervical pain." CA MTUS, Neck and Back Complaints, Initial Care states that "cervical epidural corticosteroid injections are of uncertain benefit and should be reserved for patients who otherwise would undergo open surgical procedures for nerve root compromise." Facet injections are not recommended per the Summary of Recommendations table. CA MTUS criteria for epidural steroid injections are: "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 transforaminal 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 exam notes provided do not demonstrate a radiculopathy that is specific to a dermatome on physical exam. In addition there is lack of evidence of failure of conservative care. And finally CA MTUS guidelines state that "there is insufficient evidence to make any recommendation for the use of epidural steroid injections to treat radicular cervical pain." Thus the proposed injection is not medically necessary.