

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM14-0119922 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 08/06/2014   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 02/17/2014 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 10/03/2014   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 07/01/2014 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 07/30/2014 |

### 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, 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 2/17/14. A utilization review determination dated 7/1/14 recommends non-certification of PT, tramadol, Prilosec, and Menthoderm. Follow-up and naproxen were certified. 6 PT sessions have been completed with no evidence of significant functional benefit. 6/18/14 medical report identifies neck and back pain radiating to both upper and lower extremities with paresthesias. She also has headaches. On exam, there is tenderness and limited ROM. Recommendations include medications and PT.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Continue Physical Therapy 2-3 times a week for 6 weeks:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99 of 1.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for physical therapy, California MTUS supports up to 10 sessions and cites that "patients are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels." Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT

sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the request exceeds the amount of PT recommended by the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy is not medically necessary.

**Tramadol 50 mg:** Upheld

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

**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 of 127.

**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), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. 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.

**Prilosec 20 mg:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiinflammatories with GI symptoms, PPI.

**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): 68-69 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Prilosec, California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Prilosec is not medically necessary.

**Menthoderm:** Upheld

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

**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 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Mentherm, CA MTUS states 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." Within the documentation available for review, none of the above mentioned 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 Mentherm is not medically necessary.