

Case Number:	CM15-0125925		
Date Assigned:	07/10/2015	Date of Injury:	11/25/2014
Decision Date:	08/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2015

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 66 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/25/14. The diagnoses have included lumbar strain/sprain, cervical sprain/strain, shoulder impingement, cervical radiculopathy, lumbar radiculopathy, and ankle tendinitis/bursitis. Treatment to date has included medications, activity modifications, diagnostics, physical therapy and other modalities. Currently, as per the physician progress note dated 5/14/15, the injured worker complains of chronic pain in the cervical and lumbar spine, left ankle, elbow, wrist and shoulder. He reports that the pain is affecting his quality of life and that he is tolerating the medications well. The physical exam reveals spasm and tenderness over the muscles of the cervical and lumbar spines with decreased range of motion on flexion and extension. The Speed test and Impingement test was positive. Work status is modified. The diagnostic testing that was performed included x-rays of the cervical and lumbar spine. The reports were not noted in the records. The physician requested treatments included Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of The Lumbar Spine without Contrast, Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of The Cervical Spine without Contrast and Functional Capacity Evaluation (FCE).

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 without Contrast: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-178.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Relying solely on imaging studies to evaluate the source of low back and related symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. Techniques vary in their abilities to define abnormalities (Table 12-7). Imaging studies should be reserved for cases in which surgery is considered or red-flag diagnoses are being evaluated. Because the overall false-positive rate is 30% for imaging studies in patients over age 30 who do not have symptoms, the risk of diagnostic confusion is great. There is no recorded presence of emerging red flags on the physical exam. There is evidence of nerve compromise on physical exam but there is not mention of consideration for surgery or complete failure of conservative therapy. For these reasons, criteria for imaging as defined above per the ACOEM have not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

MRI of The Cervical Spine without Contrast: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-178.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: "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. The provided progress notes fails to show any documentation of indications for imaging studies of the neck as outlined above per the ACOEM. There was no emergence of red flag. The neck pain was characterized as unchanged. The physical exam noted no evidence of

new tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no planned invasive procedure. Therefore, criteria have not been met for a MRI of the neck and the request is not medically necessary.

FCE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Practice Guidelines, chapter 7.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) functional capacity evaluation.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address functional capacity evaluations. Per the ODG, functional capacity evaluations (FCE) are recommended prior to admission to work hardening programs, with preference for assessments tailored to a specific job. Not recommended as a routine use as part of occupational rehab or screening or generic assessments in which the question is whether someone can do any type of job. Consider FCE: 1. Case management is hampered by complex issues such as: a. Prior unsuccessful RTW attempts. b. Conflicting medical reporting on precaution and/or fitness for modified jobs. c. Injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities. 2. Timing is appropriate. a. Close or at MMI/all key medical reports secured. b. Additional/secondary conditions clarified. There is no indication in the provided documentation of prior failed return to work attempts or conflicting medical reports or injuries that require detailed exploration of the worker's abilities. Therefore, criteria have not been met as set forth by the ODG and the request is not medically certified.