

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM14-0166000 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 10/13/2014   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 12/10/2012 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 11/12/2014   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 09/25/2014 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 10/08/2014 |

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in Massachusetts. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

According to the documents available for review, the patient is an injured male worker. The date of injury is December 10, 2012. The patient sustained an injury to the cervical spine. The specific mechanism of injury was not fully elaborated on in the notes available for review but did indicate there was cumulative trauma due to repetitive typing. The patient currently complains of pain in the neck and left arm. A request for C4-C7 cervical epidural steroid injection was denied.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**C4-7 CESI (Cervical Epidural Steroid Injection):** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections (ESI).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroids Page(s): 46.

**Decision rationale:** According to the MTUS, epidural steroid injections are recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain (defined as pain in dermatome distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy). See specific criteria for use below. Most current guidelines recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. This is in contradiction to previous

generally cited recommendations for a "series of three" ESIs. These early recommendations were primarily based on anecdotal evidence. Research has now shown that, on average, less than two injections are required for a successful ESI outcome. Current recommendations suggest a second epidural injection if partial success is produced with the first injection and a third ESI is rarely recommended. Epidural steroid injection can offer short term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. There is little information on improved function. The American Academy of Neurology recently concluded that epidural steroid injections may lead to an improvement in radicular lumbosacral pain between 2 and 6 weeks following the injection, but they do not affect impairment of function or the need for surgery and do not provide long-term pain relief beyond 3 months, and there is insufficient evidence to make any recommendation for the use of epidural steroid injections to treat radicular cervical pain. (Armon, 2007) See also Epidural steroid injections, "series of three." 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" injection in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The current request involves the level C4 through C7. This would be in contrast to the criteria for the use of epidural steroid injection is as outlined above that indicates that no more than one interlaminar level (or two nerve roots levels) should be injected at one session. Therefore, the request for C4-7 CESI (Cervical Epidural Steroid Injection) is not medically necessary and appropriate.