

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0125884		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/10/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/07/2000
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/06/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/10/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/29/2015

### 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:

The injured worker is a 71-year-old male who sustained a work related injury April 7, 2000, after lifting an 80-pound box with injury to his low back. Past history included lumbar spine laminectomy, June 2003. According to a physician's progress report, dated May 13, 2015, the injured worker presented with constant low back pain and left ankle foot pain. A check list revealed loss of bowel control. Objective findings included; painful range of motion of the lumbar spine; light touch sensation intact, left anterior thigh and ankle. Some handwritten notes are difficult to decipher. Diagnoses are s/p lumbar spine surgery; lumbar spine radiculopathy; probable lumbar spine disc disease; left ankle/foot strain. Treatment plan and at issue, is the request for authorization for physical therapy, lumbar epidural steroid injection, and a follow-up with pain medicine.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**PT 2x6:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines physical medicine Page(s): 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on physical medicine states: Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices. (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64. 7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36. 5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007)Physical Medicine Guidelines Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729. 1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks. Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729. 2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks. Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337. 2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. The requested amount of physical therapy is in excess of California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines. There is no objective explanation why the patient would need excess physical therapy and not be transitioned to active self-directed physical medicine. The request is not medically necessary.

**Lumbar ESI:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines ESI.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural steroid injection Page(s): 46.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on epidural steroid injections (ESI) states: 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 electro diagnostic 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. The patient has the documentation of low back pain however there is no included imaging or nerve conduction studies in the clinical documentation provided for review that corroborates dermatomal radiculopathy on exam for the requested level of ESI as level is not indicated in the request. Therefore criteria have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

**Follow-Up with Pain Medicine:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 2 General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation, Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment.

**Decision rationale:** Per the ACOEM: The health practitioner may refer to other specialist if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for 1. Consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability. The patient has ongoing complaints of ongoing pain that have failed treatment by the primary treating physician. Therefore, criteria for a pain management consult have been met and the request is medically necessary.