

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0066085		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/14/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/29/1996
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/21/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/19/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/08/2015

### 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 60-year-old male who sustained a work related injury August 29, 1996. Past history included hypertension, left shoulder surgery, 2007 and left knee surgery, 2013. According to a physician's progress notes, dated February 23, 2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of back pain radiating around the left leg and sciatic down the right leg. There is tenderness along the lumbar spine as well as the knee medially and laterally on the left, with mild effusion noted. Diagnoses included discogenic lumbar condition with disc disease L3-S1; discogenic cervical condition with disc disease C2-C7; internal derangement of the left knee, s/p meniscectomy medially and laterally, July, 2013; internal derangement of the right knee with previous meniscectomy; rotator cuff tear, left s/p repair. Treatment plan included request for authorization for medication, urine screen, EMG/NCV (electrodiagnostic studies) of bilateral lower extremities, and lumbar epidural injection.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**EMG/NCV of bilateral lower extremities:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints.

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

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapters on low back complaints and the need for lower extremity EMG/NCV 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, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures). Electromyography (EMG), including H-reflex tests, may be useful to identify subtle, focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with low back symptoms lasting more than three or four weeks. There are no unequivocal objective findings of nerve compromise on the neurologic exam provided for review. There is not mention of surgical consideration. There are no unclear neurologic findings on exam. For these reasons, criteria for lower extremity EMG/NCV have not been met as set forth in the ACOEM. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**Lumbar Epidural Injection:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections (ESIs).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on epidural steroid injections (ESI) states: Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003)

(CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) 8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The patient has a history of previous epidural injection without documentation of 50% pain relief for 6-8 weeks with a decrease in medication use. Therefore, criteria for repeat epidural steroid Injection have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.