

Case Number:	CM14-0213739		
Date Assigned:	12/31/2014	Date of Injury:	09/09/2013
Decision Date:	02/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/15/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/22/2014

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 patient sustained a work-related injury on September 9 2013. Subsequently, the patient developed a chronic low back pain. According to a progress report dated on November 19 2014, the patient was complaining of low back pain radiating to right lower extremity, right shoulder pain and neck pain with a severity rated 9/10. The patient physical examination did not documented any focal neurological signs. The provider requested authorization for the following tests.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bilateral lower extremity EMG/NCV: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines (MTUS page 303 from ACOEM guidelines), <Electromyography (EMG), including H-reflex tests, may be useful to identify subtle, focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than three or four weeks>. EMG has excellent ability to identify abnormalities related to disc protrusion (MTUS page 304 from ACOEM guidelines). According to MTUS guidelines, needle EMG study helps identify subtle neurological focal dysfunction in patients with neck and arm symptoms. << When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks>> (page 178). EMG is indicated to clarify nerve dysfunction in case of suspected disc herniation (page 182). EMG is useful to identify physiological insult and anatomical defect in case of neck pain (page 179). Although the patient developed a back pain, there is no clear evidence that the patient developed peripheral nerve dysfunction or nerve root damage. Therefore, the request for Bilateral lower extremity EMG/NCV is not medically necessary.

Flex/ext xray of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 309.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, X ray of the lumbar spine is indicated in case of fracture or infection. There is no clear evidence that the patient is suffering from any of the red flags pointing to the need for an X ray of the lumbar spine. Therefore, the request for a Flex/ext xray of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

Urine toxicology: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, screening for risk of addiction (tests).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction. Page(s): 77-78; 94.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, urine toxicology screens is indicated to avoid misuse/addiction. <(j) Consider the use of a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs>. In this case, there is no documentation of drug abuse or aberrant behavior. There is no documentation of drug abuse or misuse. There is no rationale provided for requesting UDS test. Therefore, Urine Drug screen is not medically necessary.