MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0215488		
Date Assigned:	01/05/2015	Date of Injury:	08/28/2006
Decision Date:	02/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/12/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/22/2014

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 8/28/06. A utilization review determination dated 12/12/14 recommends non-certification/modification of Norco, lorazepam, and lumbar facet block. Facet blocks were performed previously on 3/13/14 and the frequency and dosage of pain medication remained unchanged following the procedure per the utilization review report. 11/26/14 medical report identifies low back pain. Previous facet joint injection was said to provide 75% pain relief lasting more than 6 months with improvement in function and quality of life with decrease in medication intake. She is interested in repeating therapeutic injections. On exam, there is tenderness and 50% restriction of extension.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5/325mg, #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Criteria for use Page(s): 76-80.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. 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 Norco is not medically necessary.

Lorazepam 0.5mg, #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Mental Illness & Stress

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Benzodiazepines Page(s): 24.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for lorazepam, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the benzodiazepines are Not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation identifying any objective functional improvement as a result of the use of the medication and no rationale provided for long-term use of the medication despite the CA MTUS recommendation against long-term use. Benzodiazepines should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested lorazepam is not medically necessary.

Bilateral L4-5 and L5-S1 lumbar facet block: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300-301, 309. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Low Back Chapter, Facet Joint Pain, Signs & Symptoms, Facet Joint Diagnostic Blocks (Injections), Facet Joint intra-articular Injections (Therapeutic)

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for facet injections, CA MTUS and ACOEM state that invasive techniques are of questionable merit. ODG states that suggested indicators of pain related to facet joint pathology include tenderness to palpation in the paravertebral area, a normal sensory examination, and absence of radicular findings. They also recommend the use of medial branch blocks over intraarticular facet joint injections as, although it is suggested that MBBs and intra-articular blocks appear to provide comparable diagnostic information, the results of placebo-controlled trials of neurotomy found better predictive effect with diagnostic MBBs. In addition, the same nerves are tested with the MBB as are treated with the neurotomy. The recommend against the use of repeat therapeutic facet joint injections. Within the documentation available for review, the provider reports pain relief, functional improvement, and decreased medication usage with prior facet joint injections, although there is conflicting information regarding the medication usage. Regardless, the guidelines do not support the use of repeat facet joint therapeutic injections, nor do they support the use of facet joint injections (diagnostic or therapeutic) rather than medial branch blocks for diagnostic purposes prior to consideration for radiofrequency neurotomy. In light of the above issues, the currently requested facet injections are not medically necessary.