

DECISION AND ORDER

This case is decided pursuant to Chapter 410 of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act and Rules of the Division of Workers' Compensation adopted thereunder.

ISSUES

A contested case hearing was held on November 5, 2008 to decide the following disputed issues:

Is the preponderance of the evidence contrary to the IRO Decision that Claimant is not entitled to a lumbar CT/discogram L1-5 for the compensable injury of _____?

PARTIES PRESENT

Claimant appeared and was assisted by KT, ombudsman. Carrier appeared and was represented by JF, attorney.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Claimant was injured while moving computer equipment at work on _____. She has had a lumbar MRI on June 27, 2008 showing moderate multilevel degenerative changes, large posterior disc protrusions with spondylotic ridge at L3-4 and L4-5 which, together with degenerative facet hypertrophy effaces the thecal sac on three sides without definitive spinal stenosis at either of these levels, although minimal encroachment upon the left L4-5 neural foramen is shown, with lesser degenerative changes at other levels. Claimant's treating physician is DR. F, M.D., who referred Claimant to DR. D, D.O., a neurological spinal surgeon on August 15, 2008, for a surgical consultation. Dr. D noted that Claimant was unable to have epidural steroid injections due to allergy, and has undergone conservative care including chiropractic treatment, medical management and physical therapy without relief. Dr. D recommended a lumbar discogram by Dr. F to attempt to identify the pain generator, and proposed using L1-2 as a control, and L3-4 and L4-5 for provocative discography. The Independent Review Organization (IRO) has upheld Carrier's denial of the proposed discography citing the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) and has specifically pointed out that this procedure is not recommended by the ODG, that there is no planned surgery, that Claimant would not be a likely candidate for fusion surgery without a demonstrated instability and that Claimant had not undergone a psychological evaluation as a prerequisite. Claimant has since undergone a psychological evaluation and was determined to be eligible for the discogram, and Carrier stated at the hearing that it no longer relied upon this ground to deny the procedure.

The Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) provide as follows regarding discography of the low back:

Not recommended. In the past, discography has been used as part of the pre-operative evaluation of patients for consideration of surgical intervention for lower back pain. However, the conclusions of recent, high quality studies on discography have significantly questioned the use of discography results as a preoperative indication for

either IDET or spinal fusion. These studies have suggested that reproduction of the patient's specific back complaints on injection of one or more discs (concordance of symptoms) is of limited diagnostic value. (Pain production was found to be common in non-back pain patients, pain reproduction was found to be inaccurate in many patients with chronic back pain and abnormal psychosocial testing, and in this latter patient type, the test itself was sometimes found to produce significant symptoms in non-back pain controls more than a year after testing.) Also, the findings of discography have not been shown to consistently correlate well with the finding of a High Intensity Zone (HIZ) on MRI. Discography may be justified if the decision has already been made to do a spinal fusion, and a negative discogram could rule out the need for fusion (but a positive discogram in itself would not allow fusion). (Carragee-Spine, 2000) (Carragee2-Spine, 2000) (Carragee3-Spine, 2000) (Carragee4-Spine, 2000) (Bigos, 1999) (ACR, 2000) (Resnick, 2002) (Madan, 2002) (Carragee-Spine, 2004) (Carragee2, 2004) (Maghout-Juratli, 2006) (Pneumaticos, 2006) (Airaksinen, 2006) 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) Positive discography was not highly predictive in identifying outcomes from spinal fusion. A recent 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) The prevalence of positive discogram may be increased in subjects with chronic low back pain who have had prior surgery at the level tested for lumbar disc herniation. (Heggeness, 1997) Invasive diagnostics such as provocative discography have not been proven to be accurate for diagnosing various spinal conditions, and their ability to effectively guide therapeutic choices and improve ultimate patient outcomes is uncertain. (Chou, 2008) Although discography, especially combined with CT scanning, may be more accurate than other radiologic studies in detecting degenerative disc disease, its ability to improve surgical outcomes has yet to be proven. It is routinely used before IDET, yet only occasionally used before spinal fusion. (Cohen, 2005) Discography involves the injection of a water-soluble imaging material directly into the nucleus pulposus of the disc. Information is then recorded about the pressure in the disc at the initiation and completion of injection, about the amount of dye accepted, about the configuration and distribution of the dye in the disc, about the quality and intensity of the patient's pain experience and about the pressure at which that pain experience is produced. Both routine x-ray imaging during the injection and post-injection CT examination of the injected discs are usually performed as part of the study. There are two diagnostic objectives: (1) to evaluate radiographically the extent of disc damage on discogram and (2) to characterize the pain response (if any) on disc injection to see if it compares with the typical pain symptoms the patient has been experiencing. Criteria exist to grade the degree of disc degeneration from none (normal disc) to severe. A symptomatic degenerative disc is considered one that disperses injected contrast in an abnormal, degenerative pattern, extending to the outer margins of the annulus and at the same time reproduces the patient's lower back complaints (concordance) at a low injection pressure. Discography is not a sensitive test for radiculopathy and has no role in its confirmation. It is, rather, a confirmatory test in the workup of axial back pain and its

validity is intimately tied to its indications and performance. As stated, it is the end of a diagnostic workup in a patient who has failed all reasonable conservative care and remains highly symptomatic. Its validity is enhanced (and only achieves potential meaningfulness) in the context of an MRI showing both dark discs and bright, normal discs -- both of which need testing as an internal validity measure. And the discogram needs to be performed according to contemporary diagnostic criteria -- namely, a positive response should be low pressure, concordant at equal to or greater than a VAS of 7/10 and demonstrate degenerative changes (dark disc) on MRI and the discogram with negative findings of at least one normal disc on MRI and discogram. See also Functional anesthetic discography (FAD).

Discography is Not Recommended in ODG.

Patient selection criteria for Discography if provider & payor agree to perform anyway:

- o Back pain of at least 3 months duration
- o Failure of recommended conservative treatment including active physical therapy
- o An MRI demonstrating one or more degenerated discs as well as one or more normal appearing discs to allow for an internal control injection (injection of a normal disc to validate the procedure by a lack of a pain response to that injection)
- o Satisfactory results from detailed psychosocial assessment (discography in subjects with emotional and chronic pain problems has been linked to reports of significant back pain for prolonged periods after injection, and therefore should be avoided)
- o Intended as a screen for surgery, i.e., the surgeon feels that lumbar spine fusion is appropriate but is looking for this to determine if it is not indicated (although discography is not highly predictive) (Carragee, 2006) NOTE: In a situation where the selection criteria and other surgical indications for fusion are conditionally met, discography can be considered in preparation for the surgical procedure. However, all of the qualifying conditions must be met prior to proceeding to discography as discography should be viewed as a non-diagnostic but confirmatory study for selecting operative levels for the proposed surgical procedure. Discography should not be ordered for a patient who does not meet surgical criteria.
- o Briefed on potential risks and benefits from discography and surgery
- o Single level testing (with control) (Colorado, 2001)
- o Due to high rates of positive discogram after surgery for lumbar disc herniation, this should be potential reason for non-certification

Dr. F has responded to the IRO decision stating that the Claimant meets the patient selection criteria given for cases where provider and payor have agreed to the procedure. He has not provided evidence based medicine to counter that cited by the ODG in its determination not to recommend the procedure. Accordingly, Claimant has failed to meet her burden of proof.

Even though all the evidence presented was not discussed, it was considered. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are based on all of the evidence presented.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The parties stipulated to the following facts:

- A. Venue is proper in the (City) Field Office of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.
 - B. On _____, Claimant was the employee of (Employer).
 - C. Claimant sustained a compensable spinal injury on _____.
- 2. Carrier delivered to Claimant a single document stating the true corporate name of Carrier, and the name and street address of Carrier's registered agent, which document was admitted into evidence as Hearing Officer's Exhibit Number 2.
 - 3. The proposed lumbar CT/discogram L1-5 is not health care treatment reasonably required for the compensable injury of _____.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation, has jurisdiction to hear this case.
- 2. Venue is proper in the (City) Field Office.
- 3. The preponderance of the evidence is not contrary to the decision of the IRO that a lumbar CT/discogram L1-5 is not health care reasonably required for the compensable injury of _____.

DECISION

Claimant is not entitled to a lumbar CT/discogram L1-5 procedure for the compensable injury of _____.

ORDER

Carrier is not liable for the benefits at issue in this hearing. Claimant remains entitled to medical benefits for the compensable injury in accordance with §408.021.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is:

**C T COPORATION SYSTEM
350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET
DALLAS, TEDAS 75201**

Signed this 10th day of November, 2008.

Warren E. Hancock, Jr.
Hearing Officer