

Case Number:	CM15-0090338		
Date Assigned:	05/14/2015	Date of Injury:	06/20/2011
Decision Date:	06/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/11/2015

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, Pain Management

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 37-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 06/20/2011. She has reported subsequent right wrist, neck and back pain and was diagnosed with C5-C6 psuedoarthrosis, degenerative disc disease of T5-T6 and T6-T7, and right wrist cyst and right wrist synovitis. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication and surgery. The most recent medical documentation from prior to the UR decision is an operative note dated 11/03/2014 that shows that arthroscopic removal of right wrist joint cyst and arthroscopic synovectomy was performed. A request for authorization of an MRI of the lumbar spine and physical therapy of the cervical spine 2x4 was submitted. There was no medical documentation submitted that pertains to the current treatment request.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI scan of the lumbar spine: 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 Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, MRI Topic.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for lumbar MRI, ACOEM Practice Guidelines state that unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. ODG states that MRIs are recommended for uncomplicated low back pain with radiculopathy after at least one month of conservative therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic exam. Additionally, there is no statement indicating what medical decision-making will be based upon the outcome of the currently requested MRI. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested lumbar MRI is not medically necessary.

Continue physical therapy cervical spine 2x4: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical medicine Page(s): 98. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck & Upper Back Chapter, Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for additional physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions status post cervical laminectomy surgery in 8/2014, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. In light of the above issues, the currently requested additional physical therapy is not medically necessary.