

Case Number:	CM15-0091325		
Date Assigned:	05/19/2015	Date of Injury:	05/27/2010
Decision Date:	10/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/12/2015

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: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 42-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 05/27/2010 reporting injuries to the neck, low back, right shoulder and bilateral knees. On provider visit dated 04/30/2015 the injured worker has reported knees, neck pain, back pain and right shoulder pain. On examination there was tenderness noted over the occipital prominence, positive lumbar and left SI joint tenderness to touch, and positive straight leg raise. Left knee effusion at the lateral knee, positive tenderness to palpation of popliteal and lateral aspect of joint. Left knee also revealed effusion and tender to medial joint line and popliteal fossa, McMurray's with endpoint pain and crepitus medially and laterally. The diagnoses have included sprain of unspecified site of knee and leg, pain in joint involving pelvic region and thigh, sacroilitis not elsewhere classified, other symptoms referable to back and thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis unspecified. Treatment to date has included medication. The provider requested EMG (electromyogram) of left lower extremity, NCV (nerve conduction velocity) of the left lower extremity, EMG(electromyogram) of right lower extremity, NCV (nerve conduction velocity) of the right lower extremity, MRI of the right knee, MRI of the lumbar spine, MRI left knee, MRI of the cervical spine, and MRI of right shoulder.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

EMG of left lower extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), EMGs (electromyography).

Decision rationale: According to the Official Disability Guidelines, EMG's are recommended as an option and may be useful to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, after 1-month conservative therapy, but EMG's are not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious. The clinical information submitted for review fails to meet the evidence-based guidelines for the requested service. EMG of left lower extremity is not medically necessary.

NCV of left lower extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Nerve conduction studies (NCS).

Decision rationale: According to the Official Disability Guidelines, nerve conduction studies are not recommended. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms based on radiculopathy. Neurological testing procedures have limited overall diagnostic accuracy in detecting disc herniation with suspected radiculopathy. NCV of left lower extremity is not medically necessary.

EMG of right lower extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), EMGs (electromyography).

Decision rationale: According to the Official Disability Guidelines, EMG's are recommended as an option and may be useful to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, after 1-month conservative therapy, but EMG's are not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious. The clinical information submitted for review fails to meet the evidence-based guidelines for the requested service. EMG of right lower extremity is not medically necessary.

NCV of right lower extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Nerve conduction studies (NCS).

Decision rationale: According to the Official Disability Guidelines, nerve conduction studies are not recommended. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms based on radiculopathy. Neurological testing procedures have limited overall diagnostic accuracy in detecting disc herniation with suspected radiculopathy. NCV of right lower extremity is not medically necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-305.

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS states 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 who 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. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. The medical record fails to document sufficient findings indicative of nerve root compromise, which would warrant an MRI of the lumbar spine. MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

MRI of the right shoulder: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 207-209.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, the primary criteria for ordering imaging studies are emergence of a red flag, physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurovascular dysfunction, failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery, or clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. The medical record is lacking documentation in any of the above criteria. MRI of the right shoulder is not medically necessary.

MRI of the right knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and Leg.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg (Acute & Chronic), MRI's (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: The Official Disability Guidelines state that an MRI of the knee is indicated if internal derangement is suspected. The patient's physical exam shows only some swelling and tenderness. No red-flag indications are present in the medical record. MRI of the knee is not medically necessary. MRI of the right knee is not medically necessary.

MRI of the left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and leg.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg (Acute & Chronic), MRI's (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: The Official Disability Guidelines state that an MRI of the knee is indicated if internal derangement is suspected. The patient's physical exam shows only some swelling and tenderness. No red-flag indications are present in the medical record. MRI of the knee is not medically necessary. MRI of the right knee is not medically necessary.

MRI of the cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-179.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177, 178, 182.

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that an MRI or CT is recommended to validate diagnosis of nerve root compromise, based on clear history and physical examination findings, in preparation for invasive procedure. In addition, the ACOEM Guidelines state the following criteria for ordering imaging studies: 1. Emergence of a red flag, 2. Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, 3. Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery, 4. Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. There is no documentation of any of the above criteria supporting a recommendation of a cervical MRI. MRI of the cervical spine is not medically necessary.