The DYLL REVIEW
We take the worry out of Peer Reviews
25 Highland Park Village #100-177 Dallas TX 75205
Phone: 888-950-4333 Fax: 888-9504-4443

September 16, 2015

IRO CASE #:

DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OR SERVICES IN DISPUTE:

Medical Necessity: Lumbar ESI

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

The physician performing this review is Board Certified, American Board of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. The physician is certified in pain management. The physician has a private practice of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation,. The physician is a member of the Texas Medical Association and the. The physician is licensed in Texas and Michigan and has been in practice for over 25 years.

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)

Provide a description of the review outcome that clearly states whether medical necessity exists for each of the health care services in dispute.

Upon independent review, the physician finds that the previous adverse determination should be ~ Upheld

PATIENT CLINICAL HISTORY [SUMMARY]:

This lady apparently felt a pop in her back when reaching and moving a x. There is a comment of radiating pain and numbness and tingling, but no neurological loss based upon strength and reflexes. Some of the records are hard to read. She was diagnosed with a lumbar sprain and received PT. She apparently had a lumbar MRI. The actual report was not presented. The MRI reportedly showed a disc herniations at L3/4 with left lateral recess and foraminal stenosis and a broad based disc protrusion at L1/2 with facet arthropathy at L4/5 and anterolithesis.

There are comments of a prior vertebroplasty at L1. There was muscle spasms on examination. I did not see a straight leg raising reported.

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

Decision: to uphold the previous Adverse Determinations. Deny ESI
At no time is there a description of a specific radicular (dermatomal) pain pattern for a radiculopathy. There is no neurological loss described. I could not determine any neurological abnormalities. Hence, the diagnosis of a radiculopathy was not established.

The ODG recognizes that there can be asymptomatic abnormalities on the MRI. Further the ODG will accept the role of an ESI as partial treatment of radicular pain.

From the ODG. (emphasis mine)

Epidural steroid injections (ESIs), therapeutic	Recommended as a possible option for short-term treatment of radicular pain **(defined as pain in dermatomal distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy**) with use in conjunction with active rehab efforts. Not recommended for spinal stenosis or for nonspecific low back pain. See specific criteria for use below. Radiculopathy symptoms are generally due to herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal stenosis, but ESIs have not been found to be as beneficial a treatment for the latter condition. According to SPORT, ESIs are associated with less improvement in spinal stenosis. (Radcliff, 2013) *Short-term symptoms:* The American Academy of Neurology recently concluded that epidural steroid injections may lead to an improvement in radicular pain between 2 and 6 weeks following the injection, but they do not affect impairment of function or the need for surgery and do not provide long-term pain relief beyond 3 months. (Armon, 2007) Epidural steroid injection can offer short-term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. There is little information on improved function or return to work. **There is no high-level evidence to support the use of epidural injections of steroids, local anesthetics, and/or opioids as a treatment for acute low back pain without radiculopathy.** (Benzon, 1986) (ISIS, 1999) (DePalma, 2005) (Molloy, 2005) (Wilson-MacDonald, 2005) … **ESIs may be helpful with radicular symptoms not responsive to 2 to 6 weeks of conservative therapy. (Kinkade, 2007) Epidural steroid injections are an option for short-term pain relief of persistent radiculopathy, although not for nonspecific low back pain or spinal stenosis. (Chou, 2008) …** ***Patient selection:* Radiculopathy must be documented, as indicated**

25 Highland Park Village #100-177 Dallas TX 75205
Phone: 888-950-4333 Fax: 888-9504-4443

in the ODG criteria. In addition, ESIs are more often successful in patients without significant compression of the nerve root and, therefore, in whom an inflammatory basis for radicular pain is most likely. In such patients, a success rate of 75% renders ESI an attractive temporary alternative to surgery, but in patients with significant compression of the nerve root, the likelihood of benefiting from ESI is low (26%). This success rate may be no more than that of a placebo effect, and surgery may be a more appropriate consideration. (Ghahreman, 2011) Injections for spinal pain have high failure rates, emphasizing the importance of patient selection. Individuals with centralized pain, such as those with fibromyalgia and chronic widespread pain, and poorly controlled depression, may be poor candidates. (Brummett, 2013)
MRIs: According to this RCT, the use of MRI before ESIs does not improve patient outcomes and has a minimal effect on decision making, but the use of MRI might have reduced the total number of injections required and may have improved outcomes in a subset of patients. Given these potential benefits as well as concerns related to missing important rare contraindications to epidural steroid injection, plus the small benefits of ESIs themselves, **ODG continues to recommend that radiculopathy be corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. (Cohen, 2012)…**

Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections:
Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, reduction of medication use and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit.
(1) Radiculopathy (due to herniated nucleus pulposus, but not spinal stenosis) must be documented. Objective findings on examination need to be present. Radiculopathy must be corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing.
(2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs, muscle relaxants & neuropathic drugs).
(3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) and injection of contrast for guidance.
(4) *Diagnostic Phase:* At the time of initial use of an ESI (formally referred to as the "diagnostic phase" as initial injections indicate whether success will be obtained with this treatment intervention), a maximum of one to two injections should be performed. A repeat block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block (< 30% is a standard placebo response). A second block is also not indicated if the first block is accurately placed unless: (a) there is a question of the pain generator; (b) there was possibility of inaccurate placement; or (c) there is evidence of multilevel pathology. In these cases a different level or approach might be proposed. There should be 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) *Therapeutic phase:* If after the initial block/blocks are given (see "Diagnostic Phase" above) and found to produce pain relief of at least 50-70% pain relief for at

25 Highland Park Village #100-177 Dallas TX 75205
Phone: 888-950-4333 Fax: 888-9504-4443

	least 6-8 weeks, additional blocks may be supported. This is generally referred to as the "therapeutic phase." Indications for repeat blocks include acute exacerbation of pain, or new onset of radicular symptoms. The general consensus recommendation is for no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) (8) Repeat injections should be based on continued objective documented pain relief, decreased need for pain medications, and functional response. (9) Current research does not support a routine use of a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections for the initial phase and rarely more than 2 for therapeutic treatment. (10) It is currently not recommended to perform epidural blocks on the same day of treatment as facet blocks or sacroiliac blocks or lumbar sympathetic blocks or trigger point injections as this may lead to improper diagnosis or unnecessary treatment. (11) Cervical and lumbar epidural steroid injection should not be performed on the same day. (Doing both injections on the same day could result in an excessive dose of steroids, which can be dangerous, and not worth the risk for a treatment that has no long-term benefit.)

MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging)	Recommended for indications below. MRI's are test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, but for uncomplicated low back pain, with radiculopathy, not recommended until after at least one month conservative therapy, sooner if severe or progressive neurologic deficit…. **An important limitation of magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of myelopathy is its high sensitivity.** The ease with which the study depicts expansion and compression of the spinal cord in the myelopathic patient may lead to false positive examinations and inappropriately aggressive therapy if findings are interpreted incorrectly…**MRI reveals the usual insignificant disc bulges and herniations. (Jarvik-JAMA, 2003) In addition, the sensitivities of the only significant MRI parameters, disc height narrowing and anular tears, are poor, and these findings alone are of limited clinical importance.** (Videman, 2003) Imaging studies are used most practically as confirmation studies once a working diagnosis is determined. MRI, although excellent at defining tumor, infection, and nerve compression, can be too sensitive with regard to degenerative disease findings and commonly **displays pathology that is not responsible for the patient's symptoms**…. **Diagnostic imaging of the spine is associated with a high rate of abnormal findings in asymptomatic individuals. Herniated disk is found on magnetic resonance imaging in 9% to 76% of asymptomatic patients; bulging disks, in 20% to 81%; and degenerative disks, in 46% to 93%...Many MRI findings (loss of disc signal, facet arthrosis, and end plate signal changes) may represent progressive age changes not associated with acute events. ..** Disk herniation was visible in 35% of patients with a favorable outcome and in 33% with an unfavorable outcome, and nerve root compression was present in 24% of those with a favorable outcome and in 26% of those with an unfavorable outcome. They concluded that the MRI scan does not have any discriminatory power at all.

25 Highland Park Village #100-177 Dallas TX 75205
Phone: 888-950-4333 Fax: 888-9504-4443

	Irrelevant findings have the potential to frighten patients and initiate cascades of unnecessary testing or intervention, with occasional risks. The study showed that neither a herniated disk nor the presence of scar tissue on MRI was associated with patient outcome, but these findings may lead to unnecessary further imaging and surgery. (el Barzouhi, 2013)… Clinicians should be aware of the diagnostic limitations of MRI as there is significant variability in the interrater and intrarater agreements of MRI in assessing different degenerative conditions of the lumbar spine.

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)**