

Case Number:	CM13-0049672		
Date Assigned:	04/25/2014	Date of Injury:	12/16/2001
Decision Date:	06/11/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/14/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/08/2013

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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine 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:

The patient is a 68-year-old man who sustained a work-related injury on December 16, 2001. He subsequently developed cervical pain with radicular pain into the upper extremities associated with numbness in the left forearm and fingers. According to note dated on October 4, 2014, the patient was complaining to of her cervical pain radiating to upper extremities with numbness in the left forearm and fingers. The patient's physical examination demonstrated restricted ROM in the cervical spine, hyperesthesia along the right C6 dermatome, and positive Phalens. His current diagnoses include cervical disc disease, cervical radiculitis, and post laminectomy syndrome/cervical region. The provider requested authorization to use the medications listed below.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

CONTINUED PHYSICAL (6 VISITS): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine, Page(s): 98.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Physical Medicine is "Recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the patient) can provide short term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Patient-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of patients with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007)." There is no documentation of functional improvement from previous physical therapy. There is no clear justification for additional session of physical therapy. Therefore, the request for continued physical (6 visits) is not medically necessary.

NORCO 10/325MG (#150): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria For Use Of Opioids, Page(s): 179.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy, The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function, and Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing

Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. There is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement with previous use of opioids (Norco). There is no clear documentation that the patient is receiving Norco from a single practitioner. There no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Norco. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medications. There is no clear justification for the need to continue the use of Norco. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325MG (#150) is not medically necessary at this time.

FLEXERIL 10 MG (#390): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants, Page(s): 63.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Flexeril a non sedating muscle relaxants is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic spasm and pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case does not have clear recent evidence of spasm and the prolonged use of Flexeril 10 mg is not justified. The request of for Flexeril 10mg between #390 is not medically necessary.

GABAPENTIN 300MG (#120): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 18-19.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Gabapentin, Page(s): 49.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Gabapentin is an anti-epilepsy drug (AEDs - also referred to as anti-convulsants), which has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain. Gabapentin was already approved by a previous review.

NAPROXEN SODIUM 550MG (90): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Naproxen, Page(s): 66.

Decision rationale: The provider was already approved by a previous review.