

Case Number:	CM15-0174991		
Date Assigned:	09/16/2015	Date of Injury:	10/16/2013
Decision Date:	10/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/04/2015

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 49 year old male with a date of injury of October 16, 2013. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for lumbar strain, contusion of back, lumbar stenosis and lumbar pain. Medical records dated May 5, 2015 indicate that the injured worker complains of back pain toward the left buttock, thigh, and calf, and left leg occasionally giving out. A progress note dated August 21, 2015 notes subjective complaints of back and leg pain rated at a level of 7 to 8 out of 10. Per the treating physician (August 21, 2015), the employee was unable to work. The physical exam dated May 5, 2015 reveals moderate discomfort on palpation of the mid lumbar spine, and a slow gait. The progress note dated August 21, 2015 documented a physical examination that showed diffuse tenderness to palpation of the mid lumbar spine, positive straight leg raise on the left, and diminished light touch to the lateral shin and anterior foot on the left. Treatment has included lumbar medial branch block, epidural steroid injection, magnetic resonance imaging (December 19, 2013) that showed annular fissuring at L5-S1 and degenerative changes, unknown number of chiropractic treatments, unknown number of physical therapy sessions, and medications (Flexeril, Gabapentin and Tramadol noted on April 28, 2015). The original utilization review (August 27, 2015) non-certified a request for magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine without contrast.

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 Low Back Complaints 2004. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, MRI's.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

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.