

Case Number:	CM15-0076139		
Date Assigned:	05/29/2015	Date of Injury:	12/25/2003
Decision Date:	06/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/21/2015

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 58-year-old female with an industrial injury dated 12/25/2003. The injured worker's diagnoses include lumbar spine disc bulges, status post total left hip replacement in 8/2004, and probable right knee internal derangement. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 2/24/2015, the injured worker reported low back pain and right knee pain radiating to her leg. Objective findings revealed tenderness of right knee and painful range of motion of the right knee. The treating physician noted that the injured worker uses a single point cane. Some documents within the submitted medical records are difficult to decipher. The treating physician prescribed services for one smooth rider cycle, one resistance chair and one transforaminal epidural injection L5-S1 now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 smooth rider cycle: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Exercise.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, durable medical equipment.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested item. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on durable medical equipment, DME is primarily and customarily used to serve a medical purpose and generally not useful to a person in the absence of illness or injury. DME equipment is defined as equipment that can withstand repeated use i.e. can be rented and used by successive patients, primarily serves a medical function and is appropriate for use in a patient's home. The equipment itself is not rentable or able to be used by successive patients. It does not serve a primary medical purpose that cannot be accomplished without it. Therefore, criteria have not been met per the ODG and the request is not certified.

1 resistance chair: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, durable medical equipment.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested item. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on durable medical equipment, DME is primarily and customarily used to serve a medical purpose and generally not useful to a person in the absence of illness or injury. DME equipment is defined as equipment that can withstand repeated use i.e. can be rented and used by successive patients, primarily serves a medical function and is appropriate for use in a patient's home. The equipment itself is not rentable or able to be used by successive patients. It does not serve a primary medical purpose that cannot be accomplished without it. Therefore, criteria have not been met per the ODG and the request is not certified.

1 transforaminal epidural injection L5-S1: 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 injection 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 researches does not support a 'series-of-three' injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The provided clinical documentation for review shows that previous ESI did not produce lasting benefits for 6- 8 weeks with pain reduction of 50% and decrease in medication usage. Therefore, the request is not certified.