

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0067304		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/15/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/03/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/14/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/02/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/09/2015

### 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 42 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on August 3, 2011. He reported an injury to his low back. The injured worker was diagnosed as having psychogenic lower extremity paralysis versus central nervous system abnormality, as of yet undiagnosed. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, epidural steroid injection, electronic stimulation, psychological consultation and medications. On March 3, 2015, the injured worker complained of lower back pain and leg pain rated a 10 on a 1-10 pain scale at all times. He also reported headaches and shoulder pain. He noted severe pain, significantly limited activities and extreme depression. The treatment plan included an MRI of the brain, cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine along with spinal surgery consultation.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI of cervical spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 178.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-178.

**Decision rationale:** Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag. Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery. Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. The provided progress notes fails to show any documentation of indications for imaging studies of the neck as outlined above per the ACOEM. There was no emergence of red flag. The neck pain was characterized as unchanged. The physical exam noted no evidence of new tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no planned invasive procedure. Therefore, criteria have not been met for a MRI of the neck and the request is not certified.