

Case Number:	CM14-0215849		
Date Assigned:	01/05/2015	Date of Injury:	08/13/2013
Decision Date:	02/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/23/2014

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: North Carolina
 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 46 year old female with a date of injury of August 13, 2013. The results of the injury include low back pain and numbness of the right leg that runs down the back of her heel. Diagnosis include lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar sprain/strain, major depression-mild, and chronic pain syndrome. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) scan of the lumbar spine revealed mild to moderate disc protrusion eccentrically towards the right with possible impingement on L5 nerve. Previous treatment included omeprazole, Penopufen, and aleve. Progress report dated December 24, 2014 showed low back pain worse with activity with intermittent radiating pain down the right leg. Current medications include cyclobenzaprine, omeprazole, and aleve. Work status showed the injured worker working full time on modified duty. Utilization review form dated December 9, 2014 non certified a Lumbar MRI due to noncompliance with ACOEM guidelines.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI Lumbar w/o Contrast: 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): 303-304.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: 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 who 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. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Relying solely on imaging studies to evaluate the source of low back and related symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. Techniques vary in their abilities to define abnormalities (Table 12-7). Imaging studies should be reserved for cases in which surgery is considered or red-flag diagnoses are being evaluated. Because the overall false-positive rate is 30% for imaging studies in patients over age 30 who do not have symptoms, the risk of diagnostic confusion is great. There is no recorded physical exam that shows nerve tissue insult or impingement. The progress reports states the patient has lumbar back pain with intermittent radiation to the right leg. There is no recorded presence of emerging red flags on the physical exam. For these reasons, criteria for imaging as defined above per the ACOEM have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary or appropriate.