

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0120319		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/30/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/15/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/31/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/21/2015
<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: New York  
Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurological Surgery

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 50 year old man sustained an industrial injury on 10/15/2002. The mechanism of injury is not detailed. Treatment has included oral medications, physical therapy, and sacroiliac injection. Physician notes from the orthopedic surgeon dated 5/7/2015 show a follow up appointment after electromyogram/nerve conduction studies, CT scan of the pelvis and sacroiliac joints, and sacroiliac injection. Recommendations include surgical intervention.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Left Sacroiliac Joint fusion:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 307. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Treatment Index, Low Back, Sacroiliac Joint Fusion.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 305-307.

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS guidelines recommend surgery when the patient has had severe persistent, debilitating lower extremity complaints referable to a specific nerve root or spinal cord level corroborated by clear imaging, clinical examination and electrophysiological studies. Such evidence is not found in the documentation. The guidelines note the patient would have failed a trial of conservative therapy. The guidelines note the surgical repair proposed for the lesion must have evidence of efficacy both in the short and long term. The California MTUS guidelines do recommend a spinal fusion for traumatic vertebral fracture, dislocation and instability. This patient has not had any of these events. The guidelines note that the efficacy of fusion in the absence of instability has not been proven. The requested treatment: Left Sacroiliac Joint fusion is NOT Medically necessary and appropriate.

**Associates Service: Length of Stay Three Days:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Associate Service: Assistant Surgeon:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Preoperative Clearance:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.