

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0116830		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/24/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/09/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/03/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/16/2015

### 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: California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 58 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/09/2013. Diagnoses include lumbar spine discogenic pain. Treatment to date has included medications including Tramadol, NSAIDs and topical ointments. Per the Secondary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 5/21/2015, the injured worker reported continuation of low back pain. Physical examination of the lumbar spine revealed decreased range of motion, spasm, and tenderness with palpation. The plan of care included medications, laboratory evaluation and diagnostics and authorization was requested for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the cervical and lumbar spine and urine toxicology screen.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI of the cervical spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 171-171, 177-179.

**Decision rationale:** The patient is without acute physiologic evidence of tissue insult, progressive neurological compromise, or red-flag findings to support imaging request. Criteria for ordering imaging studies include Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electrodiagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication for the MRI of the cervical spine nor document any specific clinical findings to support this imaging study as the patient is without neurological deficits throughout bilateral upper extremities. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MRI of the cervical spine is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**MRI of the lumbar spine:** 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:** Per ACOEM Treatment Guidelines for the Lower Back Disorders, under Special Studies and Diagnostic and Treatment Considerations, states Criteria for ordering imaging studies, include Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electrodiagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication for MRI of the lumbar spine nor document any specific clinical findings to support this imaging study as the patient is without specific dermatomal or myotomal neurological deficits. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Urine toxicology screen:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug testing.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing Page(s): 43.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Guidelines, urine drug screening is recommended as an option before a therapeutic trial of opioids and for on-going management to differentiate issues of abuse, addiction, misuse, or poor pain control; none of which apply to this patient who has been prescribed long-term opioid this chronic injury. Presented medical reports from the provider have unchanged chronic severe pain symptoms with unchanged clinical findings of restricted range and tenderness without acute new deficits or red-flag condition changes. Treatment plan remains unchanged with continued medication refills without change in dosing or prescription for chronic pain. There is no report of aberrant behaviors, illicit drug use, and report of acute injury or change in clinical findings or risk factors to support frequent UDS. Documented abuse, misuse, poor pain control, history of unexpected positive results for a non-prescribed scheduled drug or illicit drug or history of negative results for prescribed medications may warrant UDS and place the patient in a higher risk level; however, none are provided. The urine toxicology screen is not medically necessary and appropriate.