

Case Number:	CM15-0128039		
Date Assigned:	07/14/2015	Date of Injury:	06/06/2013
Decision Date:	08/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/02/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 33 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/6/13. He reported low back pain radiating to the right leg. The injured worker was diagnosed as having thoracic spine sprain/strain, lumbar spine sprain/strain, disc protrusion at L5-S1 with S1 nerve root encroachment, and clinical right lower extremity radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included lumbar epidural steroid injections, physical therapy, and acupuncture. Physical examination findings on 5/11/15 included limited lumbar spine range of motion and straight leg raises were positive bilaterally. Sensation was decreased to light touch and pinprick in the right lower extremity. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain and stiffness to the low back. Radiating pain to the right lower extremity and occasionally to the left lower extremity with numbness, tingling, and weakness were noted. The treating physician requested authorization for electromyography/nerve conduction velocity of the right and left lower extremities.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

EMG Right Lower Extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines, EMG may be useful to identify subtle, focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than three or four weeks. The requesting physician does not provide explanation of why EMG would be necessary for this injured worker, who already has identified pathology. The request for EMG right lower extremity is determined to not be medically necessary.

EMG Left Lower Extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines, EMG may be useful to identify subtle, focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than three or four weeks. The requesting physician does not provide explanation of why EMG would be necessary for this injured worker, who already has identified pathology. The request for EMG left lower extremity is determined to not be medically necessary.

NCV Right Lower Extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Nerve Conduction Studies (NCS) Section.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines do not specifically address nerve conduction studies of the lower extremities. Per the ODG, nerve conduction studies are not recommended because there is minimal justification of performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. The requesting physician does not provide explanation of why NCV would be necessary for this injured worker, who already has identified pathology. The request for NCV right lower extremity is determined to not be medically necessary.

NCV Left Lower Extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Nerve Conduction Studies (NCS) Section.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines do not specifically address nerve conduction studies of the lower extremities. Per the ODG, nerve conduction studies are not recommended because there is minimal justification of performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. The requesting physician does not provide explanation of why NCV would be necessary for this injured worker, who already has identified pathology. The request for NCV left lower extremity is determined to not be medically necessary.