

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0071592		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/21/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/19/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/01/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/14/2015

### 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: Arizona, California

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:

This 59 year old female sustained an industrial injury to the low back on 5/19/14. Previous treatment included magnetic resonance imaging, physical therapy, epidural steroid injection (1/5/15) and medications. In a PR-2 dated 3/13/15, the injured worker complained of ongoing back pain. The injured worker reported that an epidural steroid injection received two months ago hadn't helped at all. The physician noted that a second physician had suggested another epidural steroid injection. The injured worker also wanted to try physical therapy again. Physical exam was remarkable for diffuse pain across the low back and hips with no clear radiculopathy. Current diagnoses included back pain. The treatment plan included refilling prescriptions, a second epidural steroid injections and trying physical therapy again.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Outpatient lumbar epidural injection (ESI) at the L5-S1 with fluoroscopy and conscious sedation:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation CA MTUS page 46, 2010 Revision, Web Edition.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural injections Page(s): 47.

**Decision rationale:** According to the guidelines, the 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. In this case, the claimant had received an injection without benefit. In addition, the ACOEM guidelines do not recommend ESI due to short-term benefit. The additional ESI is not medically necessary.