MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0213226		
Date Assigned:	01/28/2015	Date of Injury:	05/15/2003
Decision Date:	02/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/20/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/19/2014

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. 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
Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 is a patient with a date of injury of May 15, 2003. A utilization review determination dated November 20, 2014 recommends noncertification of Lidoderm patches, MRI of the lumbar spine, and electrodiagnostic studies. Noncertification of the MRI and electrodiagnostic studies were due to documentation that the patient had undergone the studies since September 25, 2014. A progress report dated December 15, 2014 identifies subjective complaints of axial low back pain without radiation into the lower extremities. She has issues with muscle spasms in her low back and has intermittent numbness and tingling. She is currently using Norco, Lyrica, meloxicam, and of omeprazole. Physical examination findings reveal diffuse myofascial tenderness in the lumbar spine with slightly decreased strength when testing left side extensor hallucis longus. The treatment plan recommends continuing the current medications, and states that recent MRI of the lumbar spine and electrodiagnostic studies of the lower extremities have been completed.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm patches 5% # 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): Page 112 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for topical lidoderm, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of topical lidocaine for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of the 1st line therapy such as tri-cyclic antidepressants, SNRIs, or antiepileptic drugs. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line therapy recommendations. Additionally, there is no documentation of analgesic effect or objective functional improvement as a result of the currently prescribed lidoderm. Finally, there is no documentation of localized peripheral pain as recommended by guidelines. As such, the currently requested lidoderm is not medically necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging)

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for repeat lumbar MRI, Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines state that unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. ODG states that MRIs are recommended for uncomplicated low back pain with radiculopathy after at least one month of conservative therapy. Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic exam. Additionally, there is no statement indicating what medical decision-making will be based upon the outcome of the currently requested MRI. Furthermore, there is no documentation indicating how the patient's subjective complaints and objective findings have changed since the time of the most recent MRI of the lumbar spine. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested lumbar MRI is not medically necessary.

Electrodiagnostic study: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 53. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back-Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Electrodiagnostic Studies

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for EMG/NCV of the lower extremities, Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines state that unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic exam are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery. When a neurologic examination is less clear however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. They go on to state that electromyography may be useful to identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than 3 to 4 weeks. ODG states that nerve conduction studies are not recommended for back conditions. They go on to state that there is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. Within the documentation available for review, it appears the patient has recently undergone electrodiagnostic studies. It is unclear how repeat electrodiagnostic studies would change the current treatment plan, or otherwise be indicated at the present time. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested EMG/NCV of the lower extremities is not medically necessary.