

MEDICAL CONTESTED CASE HEARING NO. 13112

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 opened on June 24, 2013 with the record closing on July 1, 2013 to decide the following disputed issue:

1. Is the preponderance of the evidence contrary to the decision of the IRO that the claimant is not entitled to a lumbar laminectomy and revision at L4-5 and L5-S1 for the compensable injury of (Date of Injury)?

The record was held open for the submission of written closing statements.

PARTIES PRESENT

Claimant appeared and was assisted by LM, who on that date was an ombudsman. Petitioner/Provider Dr. B appeared by telephone. Respondent/Carrier appeared and was represented by JL, attorney.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

It was undisputed that the Claimant sustained a compensable lumbar injury on (Date of Injury) while working for (Employer), Inc. On October 24, 1996, he underwent the following lumbar surgery performed by Dr. G: laminotomy and discectomy at L5-S1, and laminotomy, discectomy and foraminotomy on the right at L4-5.

On October 11, 2012, the Claimant came under the care of Dr. B, who is a board certified orthopedic surgeon. Dr. B noted that the Claimant had complaints of persistent back pain that was unrelenting. Dr. B ordered a CT myelogram to be performed on the Claimant's lumbar spine, which was performed on November 2, 2012. Based on the testing, Dr. B has diagnosed the Claimant's lumbar condition as herniated discs at L4-5 and L5-S1 with stenosis and neurogenic claudication. On December 11, 2012, Dr. B recommended that a decompression surgery is warranted since it would help with the Claimant's neurogenic claudication symptoms. On January 7, 2013, Dr. B requested pre-authorization to perform a lumbar laminectomy revision at L4-5 and L5-S1, and this request was denied by two Carrier utilization review agents (URAs). The Carrier denials were upheld by an IRO. The IRO physician reviewer, who is also a board certified orthopedic surgeon, reasoned that the Claimant does not meet the Official Disability

Guidelines (ODG) requirements for the surgery for several reasons, including that the Claimant's condition does not warrant a two-level decompression and discectomy surgery; inconsistencies relative to the Claimant's symptoms versus imaging study/clinical examination results; the absence of a psychological assessment of the Claimant's pain behavior or pain tolerance; and the IRO's opinion that the Claimant does not have established neurogenic claudication or even a specific nerve root deficit.

Texas Labor Code Section 408.021 provides that an employee who sustains a compensable injury is entitled to all health care reasonably required by the nature of the injury as and when needed. Health care reasonably required is further defined in Texas Labor Code Section 401.011 (22a) as health care that is clinically appropriate and considered effective for the injured employee's injury and provided in accordance with best practices consistent with evidence-based medicine or, if evidence-based medicine is not available, then generally accepted standards of medical practice recognized in the medical community. Health care under the Texas Workers' Compensation system must be consistent with evidence based medicine if that evidence is available. Evidence-based medicine is further defined in Texas Labor Code Section 401.011 (18a) to be the use of the current best quality scientific and medical evidence formulated from credible scientific studies, including peer-reviewed medical literature and other current scientifically based texts and treatment and practice guidelines in making decisions about the care of individual patients. The Commissioner of the Division of Workers' Compensation is required to adopt treatment guidelines that are evidence-based, scientifically valid, outcome-focused and designed to reduce excessive or inappropriate medical care while safeguarding necessary medical care. Texas Labor Code Section 413.011(e). Medical services consistent with the medical policies and fee guidelines adopted by the commissioner are presumed reasonable in accordance with Texas Labor Code Section 413.017(1).

In accordance with the above statutory guidance, the Division of Workers' Compensation has adopted treatment guidelines by Division Rule 137.100. This rule directs health care providers to provide treatment in accordance with the current edition of the ODG, and such treatment is presumed to be health care reasonably required as defined in the Texas Labor Code. Thus, the focus of any health care dispute starts with the health care set out in the ODG.

The ODG addresses the medical necessity of a lumbar laminectomy (without a discectomy) as follows:

Laminectomy/laminotomy

Recommended for lumbar spinal stenosis. For patients with lumbar spinal stenosis, surgery (standard posterior decompressive laminectomy alone, without discectomy) offered a significant advantage over nonsurgical treatment in terms of pain relief and functional improvement that was maintained at 2 years of follow-up, according to a new SPORT study. Discectomy should be reserved for

those conditions of disc herniation causing radiculopathy [sic]. Laminectomy may be used for spinal stenosis secondary to degenerative processes exhibiting ligament hypertrophy, facet hypertrophy, and disc protrusion, in addition to anatomical derangements of the spinal column such as tumor, trauma, etc. (Weinstein, 2008) (Katz, 2008) This study showed that surgery for spinal stenosis and for disc herniation were not as successful as total hip replacement but were comparable to total knee replacement in their success. Pain was reduced to within 60% of normal levels, function improved to 65% normal, and quality of life was improved by about 50%. The study compared the gains in quality of life achieved by total hip replacement, total knee replacement, surgery for spinal stenosis, disc excision for lumbar disc herniation, and arthrodesis for chronic low back pain. (Hansson, 2008) A comparison of surgical and nonoperative outcomes between degenerative spondylolisthesis and spinal stenosis patients from the SPORT trial found that fusion was most appropriate for spondylolisthesis, with or without listhesis, and decompressive laminectomy alone most appropriate for spinal stenosis. (Pearson, 2010) In patients with spinal stenosis, those treated surgically with standard posterior decompressive laminectomy showed significantly greater improvement in pain, function, satisfaction, and self-rated progress over 4 years compared to patients treated nonoperatively, and the results in both groups were stable between 2 and 4 years. (Weinstein, 2010) Comparative effectiveness evidence from SPORT shows good value for standard posterior laminectomy after an imaging-confirmed diagnosis of spinal stenosis [as recommended in ODG], compared with nonoperative care over 4 years. (Tosteson, 2011) Decompressive surgery (laminectomy) is more effective for lumbar spinal stenosis than land based exercise, but given the risks of surgery, a self-management program with exercise prior to consideration of surgery is also supported. (Jarrett, 2012) Laminectomy is a surgical procedure for treating spinal stenosis by relieving pressure on the spinal cord. The lamina of the vertebra is removed or trimmed to widen the spinal canal and create more space for the spinal nerves. **See also Discectomy/laminectomy for surgical indications, with the exception of confirming the presence of radiculopathy.** For average hospital LOS after criteria are met, see Hospital length of stay (LOS). (*Emphasis added.*)

The above passage refers to the ODG section regarding the medical necessity of a discectomy/laminectomy, which provides as follows:

Discectomy/laminectomy

Recommended for indications below. Surgical discectomy for carefully selected patients with radiculopathy due to lumbar disc prolapse provides faster relief from the acute attack than conservative management, although any positive or negative effects on the lifetime natural history of the underlying disc disease are still

unclear. Unequivocal objective findings are required based on neurological examination and testing. (Gibson-Cochrane, 2000) (Malter, 1996) (Stevens, 1997) (Stevenson, 1995) (BlueCross BlueShield, 2002) (Buttermann, 2004) For unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, see AMA Guides. (Andersson, 2000) Standard discectomy and microdiscectomy are of similar efficacy in treatment of herniated disc. (Bigos, 1999) While there is evidence in favor of discectomy for prolonged symptoms of lumbar disc herniation, in patients with a shorter period of symptoms but no absolute indication for surgery, there are only modest short-term benefits, although discectomy seemed to be associated with a more rapid initial recovery, and discectomy was superior to conservative treatment when the herniation was at L4-L5. (Osterman, 2006) The SPORT studies concluded that both lumbar discectomy and nonoperative treatment resulted in substantial improvement after 2 years, but those who chose discectomy reported somewhat greater improvements than patients who elected nonoperative care. (Weinstein, 2006) (Weinstein2, 2006) A recent RCT compared decompressive surgery with nonoperative measures in the treatment of patients with lumbar spinal stenosis, and concluded that, although patients improved over the 2-year follow-up regardless of initial treatment, those undergoing decompressive surgery reported greater improvement regarding leg pain, back pain, and overall disability, but the relative benefit of initial surgical treatment diminished over time while still remaining somewhat favorable at 2 years. (Malmivaara, 2007) Patients undergoing lumbar discectomy are generally satisfied with the surgery, but only half are satisfied with preoperative patient information. (Ronnberg, 2007) If patients are pain free, there appears to be no contraindication to their returning to any type of work after lumbar discectomy. A regimen of stretching and strengthening the abdominal and back muscles is a crucial aspect of the recovery process. (Burnett, 2006) According to a major recent trial, early surgery (microdiscectomy) in patients with 6-12 weeks of severe sciatica caused by herniated disks is associated with better short-term outcomes, but at 1 year, disability outcomes of early surgery vs conservative treatment with eventual surgery if needed are similar. The median time to recovery was 4.0 weeks for early surgery and 12.1 weeks for prolonged conservative treatment. The authors concluded, "Patients whose pain is controlled in a manner that is acceptable to them may decide to postpone surgery in the hope that it will not be needed, without reducing their chances for complete recovery at 12 months. Although both strategies have similar outcomes after 1 year, early surgery remains a valid treatment option for well-informed patients." (Peul-NEJM, 2007) (Deyo-NEJM, 2007) 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) A recent British study found that lumbar discectomy improved patients' self-reported overall physical health more than other elective surgeries. (Guilfoyle, 2007) Microscopic sequestrectomy may be an alternative to standard microdiscectomy. In this RCT, both groups showed dramatic improvement. (Barth, 2008) There is consistent evidence that for patients with a herniated disk, discectomy is associated with better short-term outcomes than continued conservative management, although outcomes begin to look similar after 3 to 6 months. This is a decision to be made with the patients, discussing the likelihood that they are going to improve either way but will improve faster with surgery. Similar evidence supports the use of surgery for spinal stenosis, although the outcomes look better with surgery out to about 2 years. (Chou, 2008) Standard open discectomy is moderately cost-effective compared with nonsurgical treatment, a new Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT) study shows. The costs per quality-adjusted life-year gained with surgery compared with nonoperative treatment, including work-related productivity costs, ranges from \$34,355 to \$69,403, depending on the cost of surgery. It is wise and proper to wait before initiating surgery, but if the patient continues to experience pain and is missing work, then the higher-cost option such as surgery may be worthwhile. (Tosteson, 2008) Note: Surgical decompression of a lumbar nerve root or roots may include the following procedures: discectomy or microdiscectomy (partial removal of the disc) and laminectomy, hemilaminectomy, laminotomy, or foraminotomy (providing access by partial or total removal of various parts of vertebral bone). Discectomy is the surgical removal of herniated disc material that presses on a nerve root or the spinal cord. A laminectomy is often involved to permit access to the intervertebral disc in a traditional discectomy.

Patient Selection: Microdiscectomy for symptomatic lumbar disc herniations in patients with a preponderance of leg pain who have failed nonoperative treatment demonstrated a high success rate based on validated outcome measures (80% decrease in VAS leg pain score of greater than 2 points), patient satisfaction (85%), and return to work (84%). Patients should be encouraged to return to their preinjury activities as soon as possible with no restrictions at 6 weeks. Overall, patients with sequestered lumbar disc herniations fared better than those with extruded herniations, although both groups consistently had better outcomes than patients with contained herniations. Patients with herniations at the L5-S1 level had significantly better outcomes than did those at the L4-L5 level. Lumbar disc herniation level and type should be considered in preoperative outcomes counseling. Smokers had a significantly lower return to work rate. In the carefully screened patient, lumbar microdiscectomy for symptomatic disc herniation results

in an overall high success rate, patient satisfaction, and return to physically demanding activities. (Dewing, 2008) Workers' comp back surgery patients are at greater risk for poor lumbar discectomy outcomes than noncompensation patients. (DeBerard, 2008) In workers' comp it is recommended to screen for presurgical biopsychosocial variables because they are important predictors of discectomy outcomes. (DeBerard, 2011)

Spinal Stenosis: For patients with lumbar spinal stenosis, standard posterior decompressive laminectomy alone (without discectomy) offers a significant advantage over nonsurgical treatment. Discectomy should be reserved for those conditions of disc herniation causing radiculopathy [sic]. (See Indications below.) Laminectomy may be used for spinal stenosis secondary to degenerative processes exhibiting ligament hypertrophy, facet hypertrophy, and disc protrusion, in addition to anatomical derangements of the spinal column such as tumor, trauma, etc. (Weinstein, 2008) (Katz, 2008) A comparison of surgical and nonoperative outcomes between degenerative spondylolisthesis and spinal stenosis patients from the SPORT trial found that fusion was most appropriate for spondylolisthesis, with or without listhesis, and decompressive laminectomy alone most appropriate for spinal stenosis. (Pearson, 2010) See also Laminectomy.

Recent Research: Four-year results for the Dartmouth Spine Patient Outcomes Research Trial (SPORT, n= 1244) indicated that patients who underwent standard open discectomy for a lumbar disc herniation achieved significantly greater improvement than nonoperatively treated patients (using recommended treatments - active physical therapy, home exercise instruction, and NSAIDs) in all primary and secondary outcomes except work status (78.4% for the surgery group compared with 84.4%). Although patients receiving surgery did better generally, all patients in the study improved. Consequently, for patients who don't want an operation no matter how bad their pain is, this study suggests that they will improve and they will not have complications (e.g., paralysis) from nonoperative treatment, but those patients whose leg pain is severe and is limiting their function, who meet the ODG criteria for discectomy, can do better with surgery than without surgery, and the risks are extremely low. (Weinstein2, 2008) In most patients with low back pain, symptoms resolve without surgical intervention. (Madigan, 2009) This study showed that surgery for disc herniation was not as successful as total hip replacement but was comparable to total knee replacement in success. Pain was reduced to within 60% of normal levels, function improved to 65% normal, and quality of life was improved by about 50%. The study compared the gains in quality of life achieved by total hip replacement, total knee replacement, surgery for spinal stenosis, disc excision for lumbar disc herniation, and arthrodesis for chronic low back pain. (Hansson, 2008) For radiculopathy

with herniated lumbar disc, there is good evidence that standard open discectomy and microdiscectomy are moderately superior to nonsurgical therapy for improvement in pain and function through 2 to 3 months, but patients on average experience improvement either with or without surgery, and benefits associated with surgery decrease with long-term follow-up. (Chou, 2009) According to a new study, surgery provides better results than non-surgical treatment for most patients with back pain related to a herniated disk, but not for those receiving workers' compensation. (Atlas, 2010) Use of appropriateness criteria to guide treatment decisions for each clinical situation involving patients with low back pain and/or sciatica, with criteria based upon literature evidence, along with shared decision-making, was observed in one prospective study to improve outcomes in low back surgery. (Danon-Hersch, 2010) An updated SPORT trial analysis confirmed that outcomes of lumbar discectomy were better for patients who have symptoms of a herniated lumbar disc for six months or less prior to treatment. Increased symptom duration was related to worse outcomes following both operative and nonoperative treatment, but the relative increased benefit of surgery compared with nonoperative treatment was not dependent on the duration. (Rihn, 2011) Comparative effectiveness evidence from SPORT shows good value for standard open discectomy after an imaging-confirmed diagnosis of intervertebral disc herniation [as recommended in ODG], compared with nonoperative care over 4 years. (Tosteson, 2011)

ODG Indications for Surgery™ -- Discectomy/laminectomy --

Required symptoms/findings; imaging studies; & conservative treatments below:

- I. Symptoms/Findings which confirm presence of radiculopathy. Objective findings on examination need to be present. Straight leg raising test, crossed straight leg raising and reflex exams should correlate with symptoms and imaging.
Findings require ONE of the following:
 - A. L3 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 1. Severe unilateral quadriceps weakness/mild atrophy
 2. Mild-to-moderate unilateral quadriceps weakness
 3. Unilateral hip/thigh/knee pain
 - B. L4 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 1. Severe unilateral quadriceps/anterior tibialis weakness/mild atrophy
 2. Mild-to-moderate unilateral quadriceps/anterior tibialis weakness
 3. Unilateral hip/thigh/knee/medial pain
 - C. L5 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 1. Severe unilateral foot/toe/dorsiflexor weakness/mild atrophy
 2. Mild-to-moderate foot/toe/dorsiflexor weakness
 3. Unilateral hip/lateral thigh/knee pain

- D. S1 nerve root compression, requiring ONE of the following:
 - 1. Severe unilateral foot/toe/plantar flexor/hamstring weakness/atrophy
 - 2. Moderate unilateral foot/toe/plantar flexor/hamstring weakness
 - 3. Unilateral buttock/posterior thigh/calf pain

(EMGs are optional to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy but not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious.)

- II. Imaging Studies, requiring ONE of the following, for concordance between radicular findings on radiologic evaluation and physical exam findings:
 - A. Nerve root compression (L3, L4, L5, or S1)
 - B. Lateral disc rupture
 - C. Lateral recess stenosis

Diagnostic imaging modalities, requiring ONE of the following:

- 1. MR imaging
- 2. CT scanning
- 3. Myelography
- 4. CT myelography & X-Ray

- III. Conservative Treatments, requiring ALL of the following:
 - A. Activity modification (not bed rest) after patient education (\geq 2 months)
 - B. Drug therapy, requiring at least ONE of the following:
 - 1. NSAID drug therapy
 - 2. Other analgesic therapy
 - 3. Muscle relaxants
 - 4. Epidural Steroid Injection (ESI)
 - C. Support provider referral, requiring at least ONE of the following (in order of priority):
 - 1. Physical therapy (teach home exercise/stretching)
 - 2. Manual therapy (chiropractor or massage therapist)
 - 3. Psychological screening that could affect surgical outcome
 - 4. Back school (Fisher, 2004)

For average hospital LOS after criteria are met, see Hospital length of stay (LOS).

At the hearing, Dr. B testified, as did Dr. T, who is also a board certified orthopedic surgeon and was one of the Carrier's URAs in this case. All three doctors (Dr. B, Dr. T and the IRO) rely upon the ODG in giving their opinions in this case. A review of the ODG reflects that Dr. B is correct in his opinion that for a laminectomy/laminotomy (without a discectomy), the first part of the 3-part requirements for indications for the surgery under the discectomy/laminectomy section is inapplicable because a showing of radiculopathy is not required. Dr. B testified that the Claimant meets the second part of the requirements, regarding imaging studies, because he

underwent a CT myelogram on November 2, 2012 which shows neural foraminal encroachment at levels L4-5 and L5-S1 of the Claimant's spine, which is equal to lateral recess stenosis. Under part III, regarding conservative treatments, it appears that sections A) and B) are met, in that the Claimant has been restricted in his activity as a result of his condition and he has been prescribed medications, including muscle relaxers, according to Dr. B's testimony. What is problematic, however, is finding that section C) of part III has been met. That section requires a showing of at least one of four alternatives, which include physical therapy, manual therapy, psychological screening or back school. The evidence does not establish that the Claimant has undergone any of these alternatives within a relevant time frame relative to the current request for surgery. For this reason, and after a careful review of the entire record, it is determined that the record does not establish that the preponderance of the evidence-based medicine is contrary to the IRO decision. It is, therefore, determined that the record does not establish that the requested surgery is health care reasonably required for the compensable (Date of Injury) injury.

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 (Date of Injury), Claimant was the employee of (Employer), Employer.
 - C. On (Date of Injury), Employer had workers' compensation insurance coverage with Facility Insurance Corp., Carrier.
 - D. On (Date of Injury), the Claimant sustained a compensable lumbar injury while in the course and scope of his employment with (Employer).
 - E. In a report dated February 19, 2013, the IRO upheld the Carrier's denial of the surgery in question.
2. The lumbar laminectomy and revision at L4-5 and L5-S1 is not shown to be health care reasonably required for the Claimant's compensable (Date of Injury) injury.
3. The Carrier delivered to Claimant and Dr. B a single document stating the true corporate name of the Carrier, and the name and street address of the Carrier's registered agent, which was admitted into evidence as Hearing Officer's Exhibit Number 1.

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 the Claimant is not entitled to a lumbar laminectomy and revision at L4-5 and L5-S1 for the compensable injury of (Date of Injury).

DECISION

The Claimant is not entitled to a lumbar laminectomy and revision at L4-5 and L5-S1 for the compensable injury of (Date of Injury).

ORDER

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

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **FACILITY INSURANCE CORPORATION** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**KATHRYN ANN PLEVICH
2801 VIA FORTUNA SUITE 400
AUSTIN, TX 78746-7567**

Signed this 22nd day of July, 2013.

Patrice Fleming-Squirewell
Hearing Officer