

Case Number:	CM15-0017598		
Date Assigned:	02/05/2015	Date of Injury:	08/16/2013
Decision Date:	03/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/29/2015

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: 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 injured worker is a 37 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/16/13. He has reported back pain. The diagnoses have included lumbar signs and symptoms with disc disease with L4-5 level disc protrusion with extrusion and complaint of right sided radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included oral medications, chiropractic treatment and physical therapy. Currently, the injured worker complains of back pain and right leg discomfort. Physical exam dated 12/23/14 revealed normal strength of right lower extremity with sensory decreased right L5 dermatome and straight leg raise on right caused discomfort. No change in symptoms since previous visit. On 1/6/15 Utilization Review non-certified (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of lumbar spine, noting the neurologic exam was unclear and further evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MTUS, ACOEM Guidelines, was cited. On 1/29/15, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-289; 303-305.

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the indications for imaging in case of back pain, MTUS guidelines stated: "Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks. However, it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management. 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, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures)." Furthermore, and according to MTUS guidelines, MRI is the test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, fracture or tumors that may require surgery. The patient does not have any clear evidence of new lumbar nerve root compromise. There is no clear evidence of significant change in the patient signs or symptoms suggestive of new pathology. Therefore, the request for lumbar MRI is not medically necessary.