

Case Number:	CM15-0117860		
Date Assigned:	06/26/2015	Date of Injury:	09/04/2014
Decision Date:	07/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/18/2015

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: Arizona, California
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 50-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on September 4, 2014. He has reported injury to the back and has been diagnosed with low back pain secondary to industrial injury, left lower extremity radiculopathy most likely in an S1 distribution, and myofascial pain syndrome primarily in the lumbar spine. Treatment has included medications, injection, and physical therapy. The injured worker demonstrated tremendous difficulty in straightening out, but was able to do so slowly. It was the physician's impression that he had an acute iliopsoas spasm based on symptomology. He was in increased pain. The treatment request included a transforaminal epidural steroid injection at the right L5-S1 levels.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Transforaminal Epidural Steroid Injection at the right L5-S1 levels: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 46.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural injections Page(s): 47.

Decision rationale: According to the guidelines, the criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 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. In this case, the claimant had an EMG consistent with radiculopathy but recent notes did not demonstrate clinical findings of radiculopathy. The claimant had prior relief with an ESI in the fall of 2014. The percent improvement was not noted. In addition, the ACOEM guidelines, invasive procedures are not recommended due to short-term benefit. As a result, the request for another ESI is not medically necessary.