

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0078597		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/29/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/06/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/02/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/24/2015

### 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: California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 50 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/6/13. He reported low back pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral sprain/strain, lumbar/lumbosacral disc degeneration, and lumbago. Treatment to date has included chiropractic treatment, physical therapy, and medications. Physical therapy was noted to have provided slight and temporary improvement. Currently, the injured worker complains of low back pain and right leg pain and numbness. The treating physician requested authorization for physical therapy 2x4 for the lumbar spine, repeat electromyogram/nerve conduction studies of bilateral lower extremities, and repeat MRI for the lumbar spine. The treating physician noted he was unable to obtain a copy of the previous MRI. The electromyogram/nerve conduction study is needed to rule-out subtle neurologic signs.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Physical therapy 2x4 for lumbar:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Therapy, pages 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** Physical therapy is considered medically necessary when the services require the judgment, knowledge, and skills of a qualified physical therapist due to the complexity and sophistication of the therapy and the physical condition of the patient. However, there is no clear measurable evidence of progress with the PT treatment already rendered including milestones of increased ROM, strength, and functional capacity. Review of submitted physician reports show no evidence of functional benefit, unchanged chronic symptom complaints, clinical findings, and functional status. There is no evidence documenting functional baseline with clear goals to be reached and the patient striving to reach those goals. The Chronic Pain Guidelines allow for visits of physical therapy with fading of treatment to an independent self-directed home program. It appears the employee has received significant therapy sessions without demonstrated evidence of functional improvement to allow for additional therapy treatments. There is no report of acute flare-up, new injuries, or change in symptom or clinical findings to support for formal PT in a patient that has been instructed on a home exercise program for this chronic injury. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication to support further physical therapy when prior treatment rendered has not resulted in any functional benefit. The Physical therapy 2x4 for lumbar is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Repeat EMG/NCS, BLE:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): Chapter 12, "Low Back Complaints", Table 12-8, Electrodiagnostics, page 309.

**Decision rationale:** The patient had previous EMG/NCV (no report provided) and continues to treat without functional benefit. Additionally, current submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated any change in chronic symptoms and clinical findings of neurological deficits suggestive of deterioration. There are also no identified new injuries, acute flare-up or red-flag conditions with changed chronic symptoms and clinical findings to support repeating the electrodiagnostic study. The Repeat EMG/NCS, BLE is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Repeat MRI for lumbar:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007).

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

**Decision rationale:** ACOEM Treatment Guidelines for the Lower Back Disorders, under Special Studies and Diagnostic and Treatment Considerations, states Criteria for ordering imaging studies include 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, not demonstrated here. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electrodiagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports for this chronic injury have not adequately demonstrated the indication for repeating the MRI of the Lumbar spine without any specific changed clinical findings, neurological deficits of red-flag conditions, or progressive deterioration to support this imaging study. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The Repeat MRI for lumbar is not medically necessary and appropriate.