

Case Number:	CM14-0208163		
Date Assigned:	12/22/2014	Date of Injury:	10/20/2011
Decision Date:	02/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/12/2014

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 45-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on October 20, 2011. Subsequently, the patient developed a chronic bilateral upper extremities pain for which she underwent left carpal tunnel release. The patient was treated with pain medications and corticosteroid injections as well as physical therapy without pain control the patient EMG nerve conduction studies performed on March 29, 2015 was negative. According to a progress report dated on November 3, 2014, the patient was complaining of occasional severe right shoulder pain aggravated by movements with a severity rated the fourth to 6/10. The patient was also complaining of bilateral numbness and tingling in both hands and both hands more on the right than the left with weakness of grip. The patient physical examination demonstrated cervical tenderness with normal neurological examination. The provider requested authorization for the following medications and therapies.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Functional Capacity Evaluation: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints, Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 171, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs, early intervention Page(s): 32 and 33.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, the presence of red flags may indicate the need for specialty consultation. In addition, the requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for a Pain Management Evaluation with a specialist. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. In the chronic pain programs, early intervention section of MTUS guidelines stated: Recommendations for identification of patients that may benefit from early intervention via a multidisciplinary approach: (a) The patient's response to treatment falls outside of the established norms for their specific diagnosis without a physical explanation to explain symptom severity. (b) The patient exhibits excessive pain behavior and/or complaints compared to that expected from the diagnosis. (c) There is a previous medical history of delayed recovery. (d) The patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted. (e) Inadequate employer support. (f) Loss of employment for greater than 4 weeks. The most discernable indication of at risk status is lost time from work of 4 to 6 weeks. (Mayer 2003). There is no documentation that the patient's condition requires functional capacity evaluation. There is no strong scientific evidence that functional capacity evaluation predicts the patient ability to perform his work. In addition, the provider should document that the patient reached his MMI. The requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for this evaluation. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for Functional Capacity Evaluation. There is no documentation that the patient is evaluated for suitability for a job. Therefore, the request for Functional Capacity Evaluation is not medically necessary

Naprosyn cream: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111); topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. There is no documentation that all component of the prescribed topical analgesic is effective for the treatment of back pain. There is no clear evidence that the patient failed or was intolerant to first line oral pain medications (antidepressant and anticonvulsant). Therefore, Naprosyn cream is not medically necessary.

Ibuprofen 800mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non-Selective NSAIDS Page(s): 107.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines chapter, NONSELECTIVE NSAIDS section, Ibuprofen is indicated for pain management of breakthrough of neck or back pain. The medication should be used at the lowest dose and for a short period of time. There is no documentation that the patient developed exacerbation of his pain. There is no documentation that the lowest dose and shortest period is used for this patient. Although the patient developed a chronic pain that may require Ibuprofen, there is no documentation that the provider recommended the lowest dose of Ibuprofen for the shortest period of time. There is no documentation of pain and functional improvement with previous use of Ibuprofen. Therefore, the prescription of Ibuprofen 800mg is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms and Cardiovascular Risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient has GI issue that requires the use of Prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, Prilosec 20mg # 60 prescription is not medically necessary.

Bilateral wrist brace: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Splints

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 265.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS and ODG guidelines, splinting recommend splinting of wrist in neutral position at night & day prn, as an option in conservative treatment. Use of daytime wrist splints has positive, but limited evidence. Splinting after surgery has negative evidence. When treating with a splint, there is scientific evidence to support the efficacy of neutral wrist splints in CTS and it may include full-time splint wear instructions as needed, versus night-only. Carpal tunnel syndrome may be treated initially with a splint and medications before injection is considered, except in the case of severe CTS (thenar muscle atrophy and constant paresthesias in the median innervated digits). Outcomes from carpal tunnel surgery justify prompt referral for surgery in moderate to severe cases. Nevertheless, surgery should not be performed until the diagnosis of CTS is made by history, physical examination and possible electrodiagnostic studies. Symptomatic relief from a cortisone/ anesthetic injection will facilitate the diagnosis; however the benefit from these injections although good is short-lived. Two prospective randomized studies show that there is no beneficial effect from postoperative splinting after carpal tunnel release when compared to a bulky dressing alone. In fact, splinting the wrist beyond 48 hours following CTS release may be largely detrimental, especially compared to a home physical therapy program. A hand brace significantly improves symptoms after four weeks. There is limited evidence that a nocturnal hand brace improves symptoms, hand function and overall patient-reported change in the short-term (up to four weeks of use). There is limited evidence that night-only wrist splint use is equally effective as full-time wrist splint use in improving short-term symptoms and hand function. There is limited evidence that neutral wrist splinting results in superior short-term overall and nocturnal symptom relief (at two weeks) when compared with wrist splinting in extension. Furthermore, limited evidence suggests that short-term daytime symptom relief is similar for both splint groups. (O'Conner-Cochrane, 2003) It is concluded that steroid injections and wrist splinting may be effective for relief of CTS symptoms but have a long-term effect in only 10 percent of patients. Symptom duration of less than 3 months and absence of sensory impairment at presentation are predictive of a lasting response to conservative treatment. Selected patients (i.e., with no thenar wasting or obvious underlying cause) presenting with mild to moderate carpal tunnel syndrome may receive either a single steroid injection or wear a wrist splint for 3 weeks. This will allow identification of the 10 percent of patients who respond well to conservative therapy and do not need surgery. (Graham, 2004) Statistical evaluation identified five factors which were important in predicting lack of response to wrist splints: (1) age over 50 years, (2) duration over ten months, (3) constant paresthesias, (4) stenosing flexor tenosynovitis, and (5) a Phalen's test positive in less than 30 seconds. When none of these factors was present, 66% of patients were cured by medical therapy, 40% of patients with one factor, 17% with two factors, and 7% with three factors, and no patient with four or five factors present was cured by medical management. (Kaplan, 1990) Data suggest that splinting is most effective if applied within three months of symptom onset. (Kruger, 1991) This systematic review found that the usefulness of splinting as initial treatment for improving CTS symptoms is still supported by recent literature, but these effects are temporary. Therefore, wrist splinting is not recommended for chronic wrist pain or remotely after carpal tunnel release. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

TENS unit: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, TENS is not recommended as primary treatment modality, but a one month based trial may be considered, if used as an adjunct to a functional restoration program. There is no evidence that a functional restoration program is planned for this patient. There is no recent documentation of recent flare of neuropathic pain. There is no strong evidence supporting the benefit of TENS for neck, shoulder and wrist disorders. Therefore, the prescription of Retrospective TENS is not medically necessary.