

Case Number:	CM15-0073064		
Date Assigned:	04/23/2015	Date of Injury:	08/24/2011
Decision Date:	05/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/16/2015

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, Texas
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal 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 62 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on August 24, 2011. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left ankle fracture, lumbar strain, scoliosis, severe lumbar stenosis, spondylolisthesis and protrusion. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date have included magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), physical therapy and home exercise. A progress note dated April 1, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of low back pain radiating down left leg and left ankle pain recently aggravated by physical therapy. Physical exam notes lumbar tenderness, a slow antalgic gait, use of cane for ambulation and decreased range of motion (ROM). The plan includes magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), physical therapy and epidural steroid injection.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar epidural steroid injection L4-5: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20-.26 Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: Recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain (defined as pain in dermatomal distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy). Most current guidelines recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. Research has now shown that, on average, less than two injections are required for a successful ESI outcome. Epidural steroid injection can offer short term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. Criteria for the use of ESI is 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). Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy 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. 5) No more than two nerve root levels 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. 8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. In this case, the physical exam doesn't indicate a neurological dysfunction and there is no imaging available to confirm neurologic impingement. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304.

Decision rationale: According to the ACOEM criteria for ordering an MRI for cervical or lumbar pain is emergence of a red flag (suspicion of a tumor, infection, fracture or dislocation), 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. When the neurologic exam is not definitive further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Such information can be obtained by an EMG or NCS. In this case, the primary treating physician does not document a neurological exam consistent with significant dysfunction that would indicate a red flag. There is no surgical intervention planned and the injured worker is not participating in a strengthening program. An MRI of the cervical or lumbar spine is not medically necessary.