

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0119782		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/30/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/27/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/29/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/22/2015

### 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 47-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/27/2014. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical sprain, lumbar radiculopathy and enthesopathy of the hip. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 5/19/2015, the injured worker complains of worsening headaches and low back pain with radiating weakness in the right lower extremity. Physical examination showed cervical and lumbar paraspinal spasm, tenderness, and tenderness to pressure over the bilateral greater trochanters. The treating physician is requesting lumbar and cervical magnetic resonance imaging.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI of the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back, MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): Chapter 12- Low Back Complaints, Imaging, pages 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.

**MRI of the cervical spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back, MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Disorders, Introductory Material, Special Studies and Diagnostic and Treatment Considerations, page(s) 171-171, 177-179.

**Decision rationale:** Per ACOEM Treatment Guidelines for the Neck and Upper Back Disorders, criteria for ordering imaging 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, including reports from the provider, 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 specific neurological deficit in 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.