

Case Number:	CM13-0019038		
Date Assigned:	06/06/2014	Date of Injury:	06/01/2001
Decision Date:	08/14/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/04/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/03/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Management and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 6/1/01. A utilization review determination dated 8/2/13 recommends non-certification of Medrox, Docusate/Sennoside, hydrocodone, aquatic therapy, and tramadol. 6/26/13 medical report identifies low back pain and right leg symptoms 3-4/10. Medications "do help with his pain and normalization of his function." On exam, lumbar spine ROM is decreased and there is tenderness with spasms, decreased sensation and L4, L5, and S1 on the right. Tibialis anterior, EHL, inversion, and eversion are 4+/5 on the right.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MEDROX PATCHES #1 BOX (5 PATCHES): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Medrox, California MTUS cites that topical NSAIDs are indicated for "Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the

spine, hip or shoulder. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use." Capsaicin is "Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." Within the documentation available for review, none of the abovementioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Medrox is not medically necessary.

DOCUSATE/SENNOSIDE 50/8.6, #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 76-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for DOCUSATE/SENNOSIDE, California MTUS does support the prophylaxis/treatment of constipation secondary to opioid use. However, as opioids are not medically necessary, the currently requested DOCUSATE/SENNOSIDE is not medically necessary.

HYDROCODONE/APAP 10/325MG, #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 76-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for hydrocodone/APAP, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that, due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS). Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested hydrocodone/APAP is not medically necessary.

12 AQUATIC THERAPY SESSIONS: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 22, 98-99.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for 12 aquatic therapy sessions, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines note that up to 10 aquatic therapy are recommended as an optional form of exercise therapy where available as an alternative to land-based physical therapy. They go on to state that it is specifically recommended whenever reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation indicating why the patient would require therapy in a reduced weight-bearing environment rather than land-based therapy/independent home exercise. Additionally, the proposed number of sessions exceeds the recommendations of the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested 12 aquatic therapy sessions are not medically necessary.

TRAMADOL #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 76-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for tramadol, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that, due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS). Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested tramadol is not medically necessary.