MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0012220		
Date Assigned:	01/29/2015	Date of Injury:	10/01/2012
Decision Date:	03/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/23/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/21/2015

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: Indiana
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 injured worker was a 52 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury, October 1, 2012. The injury occurred when scaffolding collapsed landed directly after falling two stories fell directly on his feet. The injured worker did not initially go the hospital, but went the following day due to severe pain. The injured worker was diagnosed with protrusion L3-L4 and L4-L5, status post lumbar decompression L4-L5, reactive anxiety and reactive depression. The injured worker previously received the following treatments hydrocodone, Tramadol, Tramadol, Naproxen, Cyclobenzaprine, laboratory studies, lower extremity electromyography, EMG/NCS (electromyography and nerve conduction studies) to the lower extremities, TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulator) unit and LSO and home exercise program. According to progress note of December 26, 2014, the injured workers chief complaint was low back pain with left greater than the right lower extremity symptoms.On December 5, 2014, the primary treating physician requested diagnostic epidural injection left L3-L4 and L4-L5.December 23, 2014, the utilization review denied authorization for a diagnostic epidural injection left L3-L4 and L4-L5The utilization Reviewer referenced MTUS and ODG guidelines for the decision.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Epidural injection left L3-4 and L4-5: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections Page(s): 46. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back Chapter, Epidural Steroid Injections, diagnostic

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines ESI Page(s): 46. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Low back; ESI

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic pain medical treatment guidelines state that epidural steroid injections are recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain (defined as pain in dermatomal distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy). Epidural steroid injection can offer short term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. There were no medical documents provided to conclude that other rehab efforts or home exercise program is ongoing. Additionally, no objective findings were documented to specify the dermatomal distribution of pain. MTUS further defines the criteria for epidural steroid injections to include: 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 a series-of-three injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections.Radiculopathy does appear to be documented with imaging studies.The patient is taking multiple medications, but the progress reports do not document how long the patient has been on these medications and the unresponsiveness to the medications. Additionally, treatment notes do not indicate if other conservative treatments were tried and failed (exercises, physica therapy, etc). As such, the request for Epidural injection left L3-4 and L4-5 is not medically necessary.