

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0216602		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/30/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/22/2000
<b>Decision Date:</b>	02/25/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	12/04/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/26/2014

### 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: Maryland

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Rheumatology

### 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 is a 62 year old male with date of injury 5/22/00. The mechanism of injury is stated as falling from a ladder. The patient has complained of low back pain since the date of injury. He has been treated with lumbar spine fusion surgery in 2008, physical therapy and medications. MRI of the lumbar spine performed in 10/2014 revealed L4-5, L5-S1 solid anterior and posterior-lateral fusion without canal or neuroforaminal stenosis. Objective: decreased and painful range of motion of the lumbar spine, normal motor and sensory examination. Diagnoses: lumbar spondylosis. Treatment plan and request: Caudal epidural steroid injection at L5-S1.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Caudal Epidural Steroid Injection at L5-S1:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines ESI Page(s): 49.

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

**Decision rationale:** This 62 year old male has complained of low back pain since date of injury 5/22/00. He has been treated with lumbar spine fusion surgery in 2008, physical therapy and medications. The current request is for caudal epidural steroid injection at L5-S1. Per the MTUS guideline cited above, the following criteria must be met for an epidural steroid injection to be considered medically necessary: 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 series-of-three injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic pose. The available medical records do not include documentation that meet criteria (1) above. Specifically, radiculopathy was not documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. On the basis of the above MTUS guidelines and available provider documentation, caudal epidural steroid injection at L5-S1 is not indicated as medically necessary.