

Case Number:	CM14-0187474		
Date Assigned:	11/17/2014	Date of Injury:	06/13/2002
Decision Date:	01/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/29/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/10/2014

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 Family Practice and is licensed to practice in North Carolina. 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 41-year-old with a reported date of injury of 06/13/2002. The patient has the diagnoses of lumbar spondylosis and spondylolisthesis. Past treatment modalities have included epidural steroid injections, facet joint injections and TENS unit. Per the progress notes provided for review from the requesting physician dated 10/10/2014, the patient had complaints of low back pain with some radiation into the legs. The physical exam noted no sensory deficits and negative bilateral straight leg raise tests. Treatment plan recommendations included repeat lumbar MRITENS unit, physical therapy and psychology consult.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar MRI: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to

treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Relying solely on imaging studies to evaluate the source of low back and related symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. Techniques vary in their abilities to define abnormalities (Table 12-7). Imaging studies should be reserved for cases in which surgery is considered or red-flag diagnoses are being evaluated. Because the overall false-positive rate is 30% for imaging studies in patients over age 30 who do not have symptoms, the risk of diagnostic confusion is great. There is no recorded physical exam that shows nerve tissue insult or impingement. The patient had a previous lumbar MRI in 2003. There is no recorded presence of emerging red flags on the physical exam. The rationale given by the requesting physician is for surgical consideration, but there is no documentation of pending or surgery being considered. For these reasons, criteria for imaging as defined above per the ACOEM have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

TENS Unit: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Transcutaneous Electrotherapy Page(s): 114.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on TENS therapy states: TENS, chronic pain (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) - Not recommended as a primary treatment modality, but a one-month home-based TENS trial may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option, if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration, for the conditions described below. While TENS may reflect the long-standing accepted standard of care within many medical communities, the results of studies are inconclusive; the published trials do not provide information on the stimulation parameters which are most likely to provide optimum pain relief, nor do they answer questions about long-term effectiveness. (Carroll-Cochrane, 2001) TENS therapy is not recommended for primary treatment. It is recommended for a one-month trial period and then to be used in adjunct to a program of evidence based functional restoration. There is mention of previous TENS therapy being helpful but no other details. There is also no documentation of this being used in conjunction with an evidence based restoration program. Thus criteria for its use have not been met per the California MTUS Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Psychological Evaluation: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM, Chapter 7, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127

Decision rationale: Per the ACOEM: The health practitioner may refer to other specialist if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for: 1. Consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability. The patient does not have a documented psychological issue. The request states this is for consideration to rule out somatization disorder, psychosis or addiction disorder. There is no indication in the progress notes of any of these diagnoses. There is also no scheduled surgery that would require psychological consult before surgery. Therefore, criteria for a consult have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Physical Therapy 2 x 4 to the low back: Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on physical medicine states: 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) Physical Medicine Guidelines: Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine; Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks; Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks; Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. Physical medicine is a recommended therapy for the treatment of chronic pain per the California MTUS, the requested amount of physical therapy sessions is within the recommendations of the California MTUS. The goal of physical therapy is a gradual transition to home therapy after a certain amount of sessions as defined above. Therefore, the request is medically necessary.