

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0048194		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/20/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/24/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/07/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	02/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/13/2015

### 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, District of Columbia, Maryland  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

### 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 65 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/24/2009. The initial diagnoses or complaints at time of injury were not clearly noted. There was limited documentation submitted for this review. The diagnoses have included lumbar spine status post fusion. Treatment to date has included medication. The provider requested MRI lumbar spine and electromyogram/nerve conduction study of right lower extremity.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Electromyography (EMG) and Nerve Conduction Velocity (NCV) studies of the right lower extremity as an outpatient:** Upheld

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

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

**Decision rationale:** ACOEM guidelines support ordering of imaging studies for emergence of red flags, physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery, and clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electro diagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks. Per MTUS ACOEM p 182, with regard to the detection of neurologic abnormalities, EMG for diagnosis of nerve root involvement if findings of history, physical exam, and imaging study are consistent, is not recommended. The documentation submitted for review contained no clinical findings of neurologic compromise. The request is not medically necessary.

**MRI of the lumbar spine with and without contrast as an outpatient:** Upheld

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

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

**Decision rationale:** ACOEM guidelines support ordering of imaging studies for emergence of red flags, physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery, and clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electro diagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks. The documentation submitted for review did not contain evidence of any red flag neurologic findings on physical examination. Medical necessity cannot be affirmed, therefore is not medically necessary.