

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0100110		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/11/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/30/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/30/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/26/2015

### 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 64 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on September 11, 2002. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bilateral sacroiliac joint dysfunction, status post L1 through S1 fusion with arachnoiditis, lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar spinal stenosis, and bilateral lower extremity radiculitis, L3-L4 disc bulge with facet disc disease, depression, chronic pain, opiate dependency, and deconditioning . Treatment to date has included lumbar fusion, psychological management, and medication. Currently, the injured worker complains of increased low back pain and continuing bilateral lower extremity pain. The Treating Physician's report dated April 17, 2015, noted the injured worker rated his symptoms as 7/10, continuing to benefit from Avinza and Dilaudid. Physical examination was noted to show the injured worker using a cane with pain with lumbar flexion, tenderness along the bilateral SI joints, and positive Patrick's maneuver bilaterally with positive Gaenslen's on the left side. The treatment plan was noted to include a request for authorization for a sacroiliac joint belt.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Purchase of Sacroiliac joint belt, lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints  
Page(s): 301.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and treatment recommendations states: Lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. This patient has chronic ongoing low back complaints and is status post-lumbar laminectomy. Per the ACOEM, lumbar supports have no lasting benefit outside of the acute phase of injury. This patient is well past the acute phase of injury and there is no documentation of acute flare up of chronic low back pain. Therefore, criteria for use of lumbar support per the ACOEM have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.