

Case Number:	CM15-0061096		
Date Assigned:	04/06/2015	Date of Injury:	11/16/2011
Decision Date:	05/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/30/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 59 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/16/11. He reported pain in back, hips, knees, left elbow and neck. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bilateral knee sprain, cervical spine sprain/strain and bilateral hip greater trochanter bursitis. Treatment to date has included oral medications including opioids, physical therapy and activity restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain of knee with weight bearing and decreased pain with rest. Physical exam noted tenderness of right knee and crepitus. The treatment plan consisted of right knee surgery and pre-op clearance physical therapy and durable medical.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One single positional MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the indications for imaging in case of back pain, MTUS guidelines stated: “Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks. However, it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management. 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, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures).” Furthermore, and according to MTUS guidelines, MRI is the test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, fracture or tumors that may require surgery. The patient does not have any clear evidence of new lumbar nerve root compromise. The patient had a previous MRI of the lumbar spine in 2013 and there is no clear evidence of significant change in the patient signs or symptoms suggestive of new pathology. Therefore, the request for one single positional MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

One lumbar spine epidural steroid injection: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 309.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, epidural steroid injection is optional for radicular pain to avoid surgery. It may offer short-term benefit; however, there is no significant long-term benefit or reduction for the need of surgery. There is no evidence that the patient has been unresponsive to conservative treatments. In addition, there is no recent clinical and objective documentation of radiculopathy including EMG/NCV findings. MTUS guidelines do not recommend epidural injections for back pain without radiculopathy. Therefore, the request for lumbar spine epidural steroid injection is not medically necessary.

One pain management consultation: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs, early intervention Page(s): 32-33.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, the presence of red flags may indicate the need for specialty consultation. In addition, the requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for a pain management evaluation with a specialist. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. In the chronic pain programs, early intervention section of MTUS guidelines stated: “Recommendations for identification of patients that may benefit from early intervention via a multidisciplinary approach: (a) The patient's response to treatment falls outside of the established norms for their specific diagnosis without a physical explanation to explain symptom severity. (b) The patient exhibits excessive pain behavior and/or complaints compared to that expected from the diagnosis. (c) There is a previous medical history of delayed recovery. (d) The patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted. (e) Inadequate employer support. (f) Loss of employment for greater than 4 weeks. The most discernible indication of at risk status is lost time from work of 4 to 6 weeks. (Mayer 2003).” There is no clear documentation that the patient needs a pain management evaluation as per MTUS criteria. There is no clear documentation that the patient had delayed recovery and a response to medications that falls outside the established norm. The provider did not document the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. Therefore, the request for Pain Management consultation is not medically necessary.