

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0067572		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/15/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/06/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/14/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/25/2015
<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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 66 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on December 6, 2012, incurred multiple injuries after slipping and falling down steps. She was diagnosed with a closed rib fracture, clavicle fracture, bilateral pubic rami fractures and a thoracic sprain. Treatment included pain medications, muscle relaxants, topical creams, physical therapy, ultrasound therapy, transcutaneous electrical stimulation and home exercise program. Currently, the injured worker complained of constant headache, cervical pain, radiating to the upper extremities, back pain and left hip. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included a cervical magnetic resonance imaging and a repeat lumbar magnetic resonance imaging.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI cervical:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints, Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177,182. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back, Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

**Decision rationale:** ACOEM states: 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 and Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. ODG states: Not recommended except for indications list below. Patients who are alert, have never lost consciousness, are not under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, have no distracting injuries, have no cervical tenderness, and have no neurologic findings, do not need imaging. Indications for imaging MRI (magnetic resonance imaging): Chronic neck pain (= after 3 months conservative treatment), radiographs normal, neurologic signs or symptoms present, Neck pain with radiculopathy if severe or progressive neurologic deficit, Chronic neck pain, radiographs show spondylosis, neurologic signs or symptoms present, Chronic neck pain, radiographs show old trauma, neurologic signs or symptoms present, Chronic neck pain, radiographs show bone or disc margin destruction, Suspected cervical spine trauma, neck pain, clinical findings suggest ligamentous injury (sprain), radiographs and/or CT "normal," Known cervical spine trauma: equivocal or positive plain films with neurological deficit, Upper back/thoracic spine trauma with neurological deficit. The treating physician has not provided evidence of red flags to meet the criteria above. As such the request for MRI cervical is not medically necessary.

**Repeat MRI lumbar:** 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), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

**Decision rationale:** MTUS and ACOEM are silent specifically regarding repeating MRIs for lumbar spine. ACOEM does recommend MRI, in general, for low back pain when cauda equine, tumor, infection, or fracture are strongly suspected and plain film radiographs are negative, MRI test of choice for patients with prior back surgery ACOEM additionally recommends against MRI for low back pain before 1 month in absence of red flags. ODG states: Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology (eg, tumor, infection, fracture, neurocompression, recurrent disc herniation). Imaging is indicated only if they have severe progressive neurologic impairments or signs or symptoms indicating a serious or specific underlying condition, or if they are candidates for invasive interventions. Immediate imaging is recommended for patients with major risk factors for cancer, spinal infection, cauda equina syndrome, or severe or progressive neurologic deficits. Imaging after a trial of treatment is recommended for patients who have minor risk factors for cancer, inflammatory back disease, vertebral compression

fracture, radiculopathy, or symptomatic spinal stenosis. Subsequent imaging should be based on new symptoms or changes in current symptoms. The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam, objective testing, or subjective complaints) any red flags, significant worsening in symptoms or other findings suggestive of significant pathologies after the first MRI leading towards the request for the second MRI. As such, the request for Repeat MRI lumbar is not medical necessary.