MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0122401		
Date Assigned:	07/06/2015	Date of Injury:	12/06/2013
Decision Date:	07/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/24/2015

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: North Carolina
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:

This is a 50 year old female with a December 6, 2013 date of injury. A progress note dated May 27, 2015 documents subjective complaints (lower back pain; history of radiation to the leg), objective findings (antalgic gait; complains of tightness in the back with straight leg raise; lumbosacral paraspinal muscle spasm with tender areas over the right lower lumbosacral facet joints), and current diagnoses (lower back pain; facet arthropathy). Treatments to date have included medications, imaging studies, therapy, and a lumbar epidural steroid injection. The medical record indicates that medications help control the pain. The treating physician documented a plan of care that included lumbar facet joint injections.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar facet joint injection under fluroscopic guidance bilateral L4-L5, L5-S1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, facet joint injections.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM states: Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain. Per the ODG, facet joint injections are under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are currently not recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence based reviews as their benefit remains controversial. Criteria for use of diagnostic blocks for facet nerve pain: 1. One set of diagnostic medial branch blocks is required with a response of 70%. 2. Limited to non-radicular cervical pain and no more than 2 levels bilaterally. 3. Documentation of failure of conservative therapy. 4. No more than 2 joint levels are injected in 1 session. 5. Diagnostic facet blocks should be performed in patients whom a surgical procedure is anticipated. The requested service is not recommended per the ACOEM or the Official Disability Guidelines. Criteria have not been met in the provided clinical documentation such as failure of aggressive conservative therapy and the request is not medically necessary.