

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0121614		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/23/2001
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/31/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/01/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/23/2015

### 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 60 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on May 23, 2001, incurring neck, upper extremities and low back injuries. He was diagnosed with lumbar disc disease, lumbar radiculopathy, cervical degenerative disc disease, cervical radiculopathy, and cervical stenosis. Treatment included epidural steroid injection, chiropractic sessions, physical therapy, medication management and acupuncture. The injured worker underwent surgical carpal tunnel release. Currently, the injured worker complained of low back pain radiating to bilateral lower extremities rating his pain a 9/10 on a pain scale of 1 to 10. He complained of severe neck pain and bilateral hand pain. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included a left lumbosacral transforaminal epidural steroid injection with monitored anesthesia care.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Left L4-5, L5-S1 transforaminal epidural steroid injection with MAC (Monitored Anesthesia Care), quantity: 1: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS 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 a prior ESI without mention of amount of pain relief. In addition, imaging of the lumbar spine was not provided to corroborate symptoms and physical findings. The request for a lumbar ESI was not justified and not medically necessary.