

Case Number:	CM15-0130727		
Date Assigned:	07/17/2015	Date of Injury:	10/03/2003
Decision Date:	09/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/07/2015

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: Texas, Florida, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 injured worker is a 52-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on October 3, 2003. Treatment to date has included bilateral shoulder arthroscopy, left trigger finger release, bilateral carpal tunnel releases with ulnar nerve decompression, NSAIDS, and psychological treatment. Currently, the injured worker complains of increased pain in her neck and right shoulder. On physical examination, the injured worker has a decreased range of motion of the cervical spine and range of motion elicits pain. She has slight tenderness to palpation over the trapezial and paracervical regions. She has slight stiffness of the right shoulder. The impingement sign is equivocal bilaterally and she has negative Tinel's and Phalen's tests. The evaluating physician notes that the injured worker has had a flare-up of symptoms and her previous MRI scans of the cervical spine and right shoulder were seven years prior. The diagnoses associated with the request include trapezial, paracervical and parascapular strain, bilateral forearm tendinitis, neck and back injuries, status post bilateral shoulder arthroscopy, status post bilateral carpal tunnel release and status post left ring trigger finger release. The treatment plan includes MRI of the cervical spine, MRI of the right shoulder, Voltaren, Prilosec, Methoderm gel, activity modifications and follow-up evaluation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 MRI of the cervical: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-178.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 179.

Decision rationale: Although there is subjective information presented in regarding increasing pain, there are no accompanying physical signs. The case would therefore not meet the MTUS-ACOEM criteria for cervical magnetic imaging, due to the lack of objective, unequivocal neurologic physical examination findings documenting either a new radiculopathy, or a significant change in a previously documented radiculopathy. The guides state on page 178 of the Neck Chapter: 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. Indiscriminate imaging will result in false positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. The request is appropriately not medically necessary.

1 MRI of right shoulder: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208-209.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Shoulder, under MRI.

Decision rationale: The MTUS was silent on shoulder MRI. Regarding shoulder MRI, the ODG notes it is indicted for acute shoulder trauma, suspect rotator cuff tear/impingement; over age 40; normal plain radiographs OR for subacute shoulder pain, suspect instability/labral tear. It is not clear what orthopedic signs point to a suspicion of instability or tearing, or if there has been a significant progression of objective signs in the shoulder to support advanced imaging. The request is appropriately not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Voltaren 100mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 69.

Decision rationale: The MTUS recommends non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAID) medication such as Voltaren (also known as Diclofenac) for osteoarthritis, at the lowest does, and the shortest period possible. The use here appears chronic, with little

information in regards to functional objective improvement out of the use of the prescription Naproxen. Further, the guides cite that there is no reason to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. It is not clear why a prescription variety of NSAID would be necessary; therefore, when over the counter NSAIDs would be sufficient. There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. This claimant though has been on some form of a prescription non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medicine for some time, with no documented objective benefit or functional improvement. The MTUS guideline of the shortest possible period of use is clearly not met. Without evidence of objective, functional benefit, such as improved work ability, improved activities of daily living, or other medicine reduction, the MTUS does not support the use of this medicine. It is appropriately non-certified. Also, regarding Diclofenac, the ODG notes: Not recommended as first line due to increased risk profile. A large systematic review of available evidence on NSAIDs confirms that diclofenac, a widely used NSAID, poses an equivalent risk of cardiovascular events to patients, as did rofecoxib (Vioxx), which was taken off the market. According to the authors, this is a significant issue and doctors should avoid diclofenac because it increases the risk by about 40%. There was no documentation of the dosing schedule and there is no documentation of functional improvement from prior use to support its continued use for the several months proposed. Moreover, it is not clear if the strong cardiac risks were assessed against the patient's existing cardiac risks. The request was appropriately not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Prilosec 20mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: The MTUS speaks to the use of Proton Pump Inhibitors like in this case in the context of Non Steroid Anti-inflammatory Prescription. It notes that clinicians should weigh the indications for NSAIDs against gastrointestinal risk factors such as: (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). Sufficient gastrointestinal risks are not noted in these records. The request is appropriately not medically necessary based on MTUS guideline review.

1 prescription of Mentherm gel 120g: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 105.

Decision rationale: Methoderm is a combination of methyl salicylate and menthol. The MTUS notes that topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004). This product is used to treat minor aches and pains of the muscles/joints (e.g., arthritis, backache, sprains). Menthol and methyl salicylate are known as counterirritants. They work by causing the skin to feel cool and then warm. These feelings on the skin distract you from feeling the aches/pains deeper in your muscles, joints, and tendons. In this case, these agents are readily available over the counter, so prescription analogues would not be necessary. The request is appropriately not medically necessary.