

Case Number:	CM14-0176005		
Date Assigned:	10/29/2014	Date of Injury:	08/02/1994
Decision Date:	12/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/21/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/23/2014

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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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 64-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on August 2, 1994. Subsequently, she developed chronic neck and back pain. The patient was treated with the pain medications, I did request authorization of the neck and back and lower back and electrothermal therapy. The patient urine drug screen performed on July 31, 2014 was positive for oxycodone, methadone, acetaminophen and Nor oxycodone. Her X-ray of the cervical spine demonstrated degenerative disc disease. Her x-ray of the thoracic and lumbar spine showed degenerative disc disease. According to a progress report dated on September 5, 2014, the patient was complaining of cervical and lumbar pain radiating to both lower extremities. The patient was treated with the methadone and Neurontin, Zanaflex, Percocet and Nexium. The provider requested authorization for medial branch blocks and for pain medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Diagnostic Medial Branch Blocks at T5, T6 and T7 bilaterally: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG (Official Disability Guidelines): Low Back-Facet joint injections, thoracic

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 309; 181.

Decision rationale: According MTUS guidelines, "Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain". According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, "Under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003) (Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti , 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial". Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, criteria for use of therapeutic intra-articular and medial branch blocks, are as follows: 1. No more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is recommended. 2. There should be no evidence of radicular pain, spinal stenosis, or previous fusion. 3. If successful (initial pain relief of 70%, plus pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). 4. No more than 2 joint levels may be blocked at any one time. 5. There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. In this case, there is no documentation of facet mediated pain; There is no clear evidence or documentation that T5-7 facets are main pain generator. There is no evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. According to MTUS guidelines, facet injection is not recommended for neck and upper back complaints. Therefore, the request for T5-7 bilateral facet joint injection is not medically necessary.

Methadone HCL 10mg #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-82.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Medications for chronic pain Page(s): 61.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, section Medications for chronic pain, Methadone is recommended as a second line drug for moderate to severe pain if the potential benefit outweighs the risk. The FDA reports that they have received reports of severe morbidity and mortality with this medications. As an opioid, Methadone should be used in the context of a

well established plan, tailored to the patient needs, when there is no reasonable alternative to treatment and when the patient is responsive to treatment. The lowest possible effective dose should be used. In this case, the patient continues to have severe pain despite the use of Methadone. Furthermore, it appears that a multidisciplinary approach was not used in this patient who continued to report severe pain despite the use of Methadone and other pain medications. Based on the above, the prescription of Methadone is not medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #40: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-82.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

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: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy.(b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function.(c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. 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. According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325 mg, #40 is not medically necessary.

UDS (Urine Drug Screen): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing Page(s): 43.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction Page(s): 77-78; 94.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, urine toxicology screens is indicated to avoid misuse/addiction. Consider the use of a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs. In this case, there is no documentation of drug abuse or aberrant behavior. There is no rationale provided for requesting UDS test. Therefore, the UDS is not medically necessary.