

Applied Resolutions LLC

An Independent Review Organization
1124 N. Fielder Road, #179, Arlington, TX 76012
(512) 772-1863 (phone)
(512) 853-4329 (fax)

Notice of Independent Review Decision

DATE OF REVIEW: August 22, 2008

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE

Anterior and posterior spinal fusion with instrumentation and decompression at L5-S1 with a three to five day LOS

A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR EACH PHYSICIAN OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER WHO REVIEWED THE DECISION

Board Certified Orthopedic Surgeon

REVIEW OUTCOME

Upon independent review the reviewer finds that the previous adverse determination/adverse determinations should be:

- Upheld (Agree)
- Overturned (Disagree)
- Partially Overturned (Agree in part/Disagree in part)

INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE IRO FOR REVIEW

OD Guidelines
MRI lumbar spine, 04/17/04, 12/26/06
Office note, Dr. 01/05/07
CT lumbar spine, 02/27/07
Office notes, Dr. 06/14/07, 06/18/07
Office note, Dr. 07/03/07
New consult, Dr. 07/17/07
Lumbar myelogram, 07/27/07
Office notes, Dr. 08/08/07, 11/06/07, 01/08/08, 04/22/08, 05/27/08, 06/25/08
Lumbar ESIs, Dr. 10/18/07, 11/19/07, 01/09/08
Psychological evaluation, Dr. 02/26/08
Discogram, 04/17/08
Post discogram CT scan, 04/17/08
Preauthorization determination, 07/09/08, 07/22/08

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

This female was injured on xx/xx/xx when she twisted her back while lifting luggage on and off a conveyer belt while working. Documentation revealed an MRI of the lumbar spine done on xx/xx/xx showed a trefoil appearance of the thecal sac due to epidural lipomatosis at L5-S1 with minimal bulging without deformity of the S1 nerve root sleeves as well as facet arthropathy of a small degree at L4-5 and an MRI completed on 12/26/06 after her date of injury identified no significant change when compared with the 04/17/04 exam. EMG/NCV studies of the bilateral lower extremities done on 01/05/07 revealed no evidence of lumbar radiculopathy. Lumbar spine CT scan done on 02/27/07 showed mild disc bulges at L4-5 and L5-S1 with mild bilateral neural foraminal narrowing.

Documentation revealed the clamant to be under the care of Dr. following her injury for reported low back pain that radiated into her buttocks and left hip and had undergone physical therapy, medication management and diagnostic testing. She was referred to Dr. on 05/21/07 for evaluation and was determined to have left-sided lumbar facet joint pain at the L5-S1 level and underwent a diagnostic left-sided lumbar medial branch nerve block at L4 and L5 with anesthesia only which was reported to have a negative diagnostic response.

The clamant reported improvement in her low back pain with an overall decrease in her symptoms but continued pain radiation, numbness and tingling at follow up with Dr. on 07/03/07 who documented negative x-ray findings; increased range of motion in the lumbar spine and negative straight leg raise bilaterally. A referral was made to Dr. for an orthopedic evaluation which was completed on 07/17/07 and revealed decreased range of motion with pain and spasms as well as a positive straight leg rise on the left with intact sensory and motor exams and normal reflexes.

A lumbar myelogram done 07/27/07 showed minimal anterior osteophytes at the level of L4 with no evidence of spondylolisthesis or spondylosis. Dr. noted the myelogram to show some evidence of disc herniation and stenosis consistent with the claimant's radiculopathy and ordered epidural steroid injections. The clamant underwent a total of three left L5-S1 lumbar epidural steroid injections from 10/18/07 to 01/09/08 which were reported to have provided some relief with continued residual pain.

The clamant underwent a psychological evaluation with Dr. on 02/26/08 who recommended twelve individual sessions over a three month period aimed to help reduce the claimant's negative dysfunctional thinking, her psychophysiological aspects of chronic pain and her pattern of fear avoidance of physical and work activities. It was also noted that the clamant would ultimately require vocational rehab but was not ready psychologically to accept that fact at the current time.

The discogram and post CT scan was completed on 04/17/08 and reviewed by Dr. to report it to show concordant diskogenic pain at L5-S1 with annular tearing and leakage of dye through the posterior annulus consistent with the claimant's pain. Treatment options were reviewed with her including managing symptoms without surgery or surgery in the form of disc replacement or fusion. The surgeon recommended an anterior lumbar interbody fusion at L5-S1 with a posterior fusion for lumbar disc protrusion and diskogenic pain unrelieved with conservative management.

ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION OF THE DECISION INCLUDE CLINICAL BASIS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS USED TO SUPPORT THE DECISION

The ODG evidence-based guidelines suggest that surgical indications for lumbar fusion would include individuals with structural instability of the spine and/or progressive neurologic dysfunction who require emergent decompression. Neither of those has been identified in this particular case.

Furthermore, the evidence-based guidelines suggest that individuals can be considered surgical candidates if all pain generators have been identified, exhaustive conservative care has been completed, x-rays demonstrate sufficient pathology to warrant surgery, a psychosocial screen has been completed, and any confounding issues have been addressed.

In this particular case, this individual underwent a psychological evaluation in February of 2008. It stated that this individual had inability to accept or cope with the chronicity of the condition and was not psychologically able to accept the fact that some type of vocational rehab would be indicated. These all appear to represent confounding issues that would need to be addressed in advance of any type of lumbar surgery and certainly in advance of a surgery where the risks of failure are high. Based on that information, the records do not provide a compelling indication for proceeding with surgical intervention in this setting.

Milliman Care Guidelines® Ambulatory Care Care 12th Edition

Official Disability Guidelines Treatment in Worker's Comp 2008 Updates: Low Back – Spinal Fusion

Not recommended for patients who have less than six months of failed recommended conservative care unless there is objectively demonstrated severe structural instability and/or acute or progressive neurologic dysfunction, but recommended as an option for spinal fracture, dislocation, spondylolisthesis or frank neurogenic compromise, subject to the selection criteria outlined in the section below entitled, "[Patient Selection Criteria for Lumbar Spinal Fusion](#)," after 6 months of conservative care. For workers' comp populations, see also the heading, "[Lumbar fusion in workers' comp patients](#)." After screening for psychosocial variables, outcomes are improved and fusion may be recommended for degenerative disc disease with spinal segment collapse with or without neurologic compromise after 6 months of compliance with recommended [conservative therapy](#). [For spinal instability criteria, see AMA Guides ([Andersson, 2000](#))] For complete references, see separate document with all studies focusing on [Fusion \(spinal\)](#). There is limited scientific evidence about the long-term effectiveness of fusion for degenerative disc disease compared with natural history, placebo, or conservative treatment. Studies conducted in order to compare different surgical techniques have shown success for fusion in carefully selected patients. ([Gibson-Cochrane, 2000](#)) ([Savolainen, 1998](#)) ([Wetzel, 2001](#)) ([Molinari, 2001](#)) ([Bigos, 1999](#)) ([Washington, 1995](#)) ([DeBarard-Spine, 2001](#)) ([Fritzell-Spine, 2001](#)) ([Fritzell-Spine, 2002](#)) ([Devo-NEJM, 2004](#)) ([Gibson-Cochrane/Spine, 2005](#)) ([Soegaard, 2005](#)) ([Glassman, 2006](#)) ([Atlas, 2006](#)) According to the recently released AANS/NASS Guidelines, lumbar fusion is recommended as a treatment for carefully selected patients with disabling low back pain due to one- or two-level degenerative disc disease after failure of an appropriate period of conservative care. This recommendation was based on one study that contained numerous flaws, including a lack of standardization of conservative care in the control group. At the time of the 2-year follow up it appeared that pain had significantly increased in the surgical group from year 1 to 2. Follow-up post study is still pending publication. In addition, there remains no direction regarding how to define the "carefully

selected patient.” ([Resnick, 2005](#)) ([Fritzell, 2004](#)) A recently published well respected international guideline, the “European Guidelines,” concluded that fusion surgery for nonspecific chronic LBP cannot be recommended unless 2 years of all other recommended conservative treatments – including multidisciplinary approaches with combined programs of cognitive intervention and exercises – have failed, or such combined programs are not available, and only then in carefully selected patients with maximum 2-level degenerative disc disease. ([Airaksinen, 2006](#)) For chronic LBP, exercise and cognitive intervention may be equivalent to lumbar fusion without the potentially high surgical complication rates. ([Ivar Brox-Spine, 2003](#)) ([Keller-Spine, 2004](#)) ([Fairbank-BMJ, 2005](#)) ([Brox, 2006](#)) In acute spinal cord injury (SCI), if the spine is unstable following injury, surgical fusion and bracing may be necessary. ([Bagnall-Cochrane, 2004](#)) ([Siebenga, 2006](#)) A study on improving quality through identifying inappropriate care found that use of guideline-based Utilization Review (UR) protocols resulted in a denial rate for lumbar fusion 59 times as high as denial rates using non-guideline based UR. ([Wickizer, 2004](#)) The profit motive and market medicine have had a significant impact on clinical practice and research in the field of spine surgery. ([Weiner-Spine, 2004](#)) ([Shah-Spine, 2005](#)) ([Abelson, 2006](#)) Data on geographic variations in medical procedure rates suggest that there is significant variability in spine fusion rates, which may be interpreted to suggest a poor professional consensus on the appropriate indications for performing spinal fusion. ([Deyo-Spine, 2005](#)) ([Weinstein, 2006](#)) Outcomes from complicated surgical fusion techniques (with internal fixation) may be no better than the traditional posterolateral fusion. ([van Tulder, 2006](#)) ([Maghout-Juratli, 2006](#)) Despite the new technologies, reoperation rates after lumbar fusion have become higher. ([Martin, 2007](#)) According to the recent Medicare Coverage Advisory Committee Technology Assessment, the evidence for lumbar spinal fusion does not conclusively demonstrate short-term or long-term benefits compared with nonsurgical treatment for elderly patients. ([CMS, 2006](#)) When lumbar fusion surgery is performed, either with lateral fusion alone or with interbody fusion, unlike cervical fusion, there is no absolute contraindication to patients returning even to contact sports after complete recovery from surgery. Like patients with a thoracic injury, those with a lumbar injury should be pain free, have no disabling neurological deficit, and exhibit evidence of bone fusion on x-ray films before returning. ([Burnett, 2006](#)) A recent randomized controlled trial comparing decompression with decompression and instrumented fusion in patients with foraminal stenosis and single-level degenerative disease found that patients universally improved with surgery, and this improvement was maintained at 5 years. However, no obvious additional benefit was noted by combining decompression with an instrumented fusion. ([Hallett, 2007](#)) Discography may be supported if the decision has already been made to do a spinal fusion, and a negative discogram could rule out the need for fusion on that disc (but a positive discogram in itself would not justify fusion). Discography may help distinguish asymptomatic discs among morphologically abnormal discs in patients without psychosocial issues. Precise prospective categorization of discographic diagnoses may predict outcomes from treatment, surgical or otherwise. ([Derby, 2005](#)) ([Derby2, 2005](#)) ([Derby, 1999](#)) New research shows that healthcare expenditures for back and neck problems have increased substantially over time, but with little improvement in healthcare outcomes such as functional disability and work limitations. Rates of imaging, injections, opiate use, and spinal surgery have increased substantially over the past decade, but it is unclear what impact, if any, this has had on health outcomes. ([Martin, 2008](#)) The efficacy of surgery for nonspecific back pain is uncertain. There may be some patients for whom surgery, fusion specifically, might be helpful, but it is important for doctors to discuss the fact that surgery doesn't tend to lead to huge improvements on average, about a 10- to 20-point improvement in function on a 100-point scale, and a significant proportion of patients still need to take pain medication and don't return to full function. ([Chou, 2008](#)) Lumbar spinal fusion surgeries use bone grafts,

and are sometimes combined with metal devices, to produce a rigid connection between two or more adjacent vertebrae. The therapeutic objective of spinal fusion surgery for patients with low back problems is to prevent any movement in the intervertebral spaces between the fused vertebrae, thereby reducing pain and any neurological deficits. See also [Adjacent segment disease/degeneration](#) (fusion) & [Iliac crest donor-site pain treatment](#).

Lumbar fusion in workers' comp patients: In cases of workers' compensation, patient outcomes related to fusion may have other confounding variables that may affect overall success of the procedure, which should be considered. Until further research is conducted there remains insufficient evidence to recommend fusion for chronic low back pain in the absence of stenosis and spondylolisthesis, and this treatment for this condition remains "under study." It appears that workers' compensation populations require particular scrutiny when being considered for fusion for chronic low back pain, as there is evidence of poorer outcomes in subgroups of patients who were receiving compensation or involved in litigation. ([Fritzell-Spine, 2001](#)) ([Harris-JAMA, 2005](#)) ([Maghout-Juratli, 2006](#)) ([Atlas, 2006](#)) Despite poorer outcomes in workers' compensation patients, utilization is much higher in this population than in group health. ([Texas, 2001](#)) ([NCCI, 2006](#)) Presurgical biopsychosocial variables predict patient outcomes from lumbar fusion, which may help improve patient selection. Workers' compensation status, smoking, depression, and litigation were the most consistent presurgical predictors of poorer patient outcomes. Other predictors of poor results were number of prior low back operations, low household income, and older age. ([DeBerard-Spine, 2001](#)) ([DeBerard, 2003](#)) ([Deyo, 2005](#)) ([LaCaille, 2005](#)) ([Trief-Spine, 2006](#)) Obesity and litigation in workers' compensation cases predict high costs associated with interbody cage lumbar fusion. ([LaCaille, 2007](#)) A recent study of 725 workers' comp patients in Ohio who had lumbar fusion found only 6% were able to go back to work a year later, 27% needed another operation, and over 90% were in enough pain that they were still taking narcotics at follow-up. ([Nguyen, 2007](#))

Lumbar fusion for spondylolisthesis: Recommended as an option for spondylolisthesis. Patients with increased instability of the spine after surgical decompression at the level of degenerative spondylolisthesis are candidates for fusion. ([Eckman, 2005](#)) This study found only a 27% success from spinal fusion in patients with low back pain and a positive single-level low-pressure provocative discogram, versus a 72% success in patients having a well-accepted single-level lumbar pathology of unstable spondylolisthesis. ([Carragee, 2006](#)) Unilateral instrumentation used for the treatment of degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis is as effective as bilateral instrumentation. ([Fernandez-Fairen, 2007](#)) Patients with degenerative spondylolisthesis and spinal stenosis who undergo standard decompressive laminectomy (with or without fusion) showed substantially greater improvement in pain and function during a period of 2 years than patients treated nonsurgically, according to the recent results from the Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT). ([Weinstein-spondylolisthesis, 2007](#)) ([Deyo-NEJM, 2007](#)) For degenerative lumbar spondylolisthesis, spinal fusion may lead to a better clinical outcome than decompression alone. No conclusion about the clinical benefit of instrumenting a spinal fusion can be made, but there is moderate evidence that the use of instrumentation improves the chance of achieving solid fusion. ([Martin, 2007](#)) A recent systematic review of randomized trials comparing lumbar fusion surgery to nonsurgical treatment of chronic back pain associated with lumbar disc degeneration, concluded that surgery may be more efficacious than unstructured nonsurgical care but may not be more efficacious than structured cognitive-behavior therapy. Methodological limitations of the randomized trials prevented firm conclusions. ([Mirza, 2007](#))

Lumbar fusion for Scheuermann's kyphosis: Recommended as an option for adult patients with severe deformities (e.g. more than 70 degrees for thoracic kyphosis), neurological symptoms exist, and pain cannot be adequately resolved non-operatively

(e.g. physical therapy, back exercises). Good outcomes have been found in a relatively large series of patients undergoing either combined anterior-posterior or posterior only fusion for Scheuermann's kyphosis. ([Lonner, 2007](#))

Patient Selection Criteria for Lumbar Spinal Fusion:

For chronic low back problems, fusion should not be considered within the first 6 months of symptoms, except for fracture, dislocation or progressive neurologic loss. Indications for spinal fusion may include: (1) Neural Arch Defect - Spondylolytic spondylolisthesis, congenital neural arch hypoplasia. (2) Segmental Instability (objectively demonstrable) - Excessive motion, as in degenerative spondylolisthesis, surgically induced segmental instability and mechanical intervertebral collapse of the motion segment and advanced degenerative changes after surgical discectomy. [For excessive motion criteria, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 384 (relative angular motion greater than 20 degrees). ([Andersson, 2000](#)) ([Luers, 2007](#))] (3) Primary Mechanical Back Pain (i.e., pain aggravated by physical activity)/Functional Spinal Unit Failure/Instability, including one or two level segmental failure with progressive degenerative changes, loss of height, disc loading capability. In cases of workers' compensation, patient outcomes related to fusion may have other confounding variables that may affect overall success of the procedure, which should be considered. There is a lack of support for fusion for mechanical low back pain for subjects with failure to participate effectively in active rehab pre-op, total disability over 6 months, active psych diagnosis, and narcotic dependence. [For spinal instability criteria, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 379 (lumbar inter-segmental movement of more than 4.5 mm). ([Andersson, 2000](#))] (4) Revision Surgery for failed previous operation(s) if significant functional gains are anticipated. Revision surgery for purposes of pain relief must be approached with extreme caution due to the less than 50% success rate reported in medical literature. (5) Infection, Tumor, or Deformity of the lumbosacral spine that cause intractable pain, neurological deficit and/or functional disability. (6) After failure of two discectomies on the same disc, fusion may be an option at the time of the third discectomy, which should also meet the ODG criteria. (See [ODG Indications for Surgery -- Discectomy](#).)

Pre-Operative Surgical Indications Recommended: Pre-operative clinical surgical indications for spinal fusion should include all of the following: (1) All pain generators are identified and treated; & (2) All physical medicine and manual therapy interventions are completed; & (3) X-rays demonstrating spinal instability and/or myelogram, CT-myelogram, or discography (see [discography criteria](#)) & MRI demonstrating disc pathology; & (4) Spine pathology limited to two levels; & (5) [Psychosocial screen](#) with confounding issues addressed. (6) For any potential fusion surgery, it is recommended that the injured worker refrain from smoking for at least six weeks prior to surgery and during the period of fusion healing. ([Colorado, 2001](#)) ([BlueCross BlueShield, 2002](#))

A DESCRIPTION AND THE SOURCE OF THE SCREENING CRITERIA OR OTHER CLINICAL BASIS USED TO MAKE THE DECISION:

- ACOEM- AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL & ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE UM KNOWLEDGEBASE
- AHCPR- AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH & QUALITY GUIDELINES
- DWC- DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION POLICIES OR GUIDELINES

- EUROPEAN GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN
- INTERQUAL CRITERIA
- MEDICAL JUDGEMENT, CLINICAL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACCEPTED MEDICAL STANDARDS
- MERCY CENTER CONSENSUS CONFERENCE GUIDELINES
- MILLIMAN CARE GUIDELINES
- ODG- OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES & TREATMENT GUIDELINES
- PRESSLEY REED, THE MEDICAL DISABILITY ADVISOR
- TEXAS GUIDELINES FOR CHIROPRACTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE & PRACTICE PARAMETERS
- TEXAS TACADA GUIDELINES
- TMF SCREENING CRITERIA MANUAL
- PEER REVIEWED NATIONALLY ACCEPTED MEDICAL LITERATURE (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)
- OTHER EVIDENCE BASED, SCIENTIFICALLY VALID, OUTCOME FOCUSED GUIDELINES (PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION)