

Case Number:	CM15-0132740		
Date Assigned:	07/20/2015	Date of Injury:	11/09/1993
Decision Date:	08/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/09/2015

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 70-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on November 09, 1993. Medical records provided by the treating physician did not indicate the injured worker's mechanism of injury. The injured worker was diagnosed as having status post cervical fusion, chronic pain, myofascial pain, right upper extremity weakness, anemia, cognitive decline, hypogonadism, muscular headaches, and sleep disorder. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date has included medication regimen, above noted procedure, and Botox injections. In a progress note dated June 02, 2015 the treating physician reports complaints of headaches and pain. Examination revealed slightly decreased sensation to light touch to the palm of the right hand on the radial side, decreased range of motion to the cervical spine, moderate triggers to the cervicospinal region on the right side of the neck with twitching that radiates with palpation. The injured worker's medication regimen included Lotensin, Norco, Vytorin, Soma, Dehydroepiandrosterone (DHEA), and Tizanidine. The injured worker's pain level was rated a 5 to 7 out of 10 with the use of his medication regimen. The treating physician noted prior Botox injections with the last one over a year and noted that this injection would help the injured worker with his pain and mobility, but the documentation did not indicate if the injured worker experienced any functional improvement with prior Botox injections. The treating physician requested Botox 200 Unit injections to treat the neck area including the trapezius, rhomboid, scapulae, and scalene muscles on the right side. The treating physician also requested a urine drug screen with the treating physician noting that this request is per the Drug Enforcement Administration's guidelines.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Botox 200 Units Injections: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Botulinum toxin (Botox; Myobloc).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines botox
Page(s): 25-26.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on botulism toxin states: Not generally recommended for chronic pain disorders, but recommended for cervical dystonia. Not recommended for the following: tension-type headache; migraine headache; fibromyositis; chronic neck pain; myofascial pain syndrome; & trigger point injections. Several recent studies have found no statistical support for the use of Botulinum toxin A (BTXA) for any of the following: The evidence is mixed for migraine headaches. This RCT found that both botulinum toxin type A (BoNTA) and divalproex sodium (DVPX) significantly reduced disability associated with migraine, and BoNTA had a favorable tolerability profile compared with DVPX. (Blumenfeld, 2008) In this RCT of episodic migraine patients, low-dose injections of BoNTA into the frontal, temporal, and/or glabellar muscle regions were not more effective than placebo. (Saper, 2007) Botulinum neurotoxin is probably ineffective in episodic migraine and chronic tension-type headache (Level B). (Naumann, 2008) Myofascial analgesic pain relief as compared to saline. (Qerama, 2006) Use as a specific treatment for myofascial cervical pain as compared to saline. (Ojala, 2006) (Ferrante, 2005) (Wheeler, 1998) Injection in myofascial trigger points as compared to dry needling or local anesthetic injections. (Kamanli, 2005) (Graboski, 2005). Recent systematic reviews have stated that current evidence does not support the use of BTX-A trigger point injections for myofascial pain. (Ho, 2006) Or for mechanical neck disease (as compared to saline). (Peloso-Cochrane, 2006) A recent study that has found statistical improvement with the use of BTX-A compared to saline. Study patients had at least 10 trigger points and no patient in the study was allowed to take an opioid in the 4 weeks prior to treatment. (Gobel, 2006) Recommended: cervical dystonia, a condition that is not generally related to workers' compensation injuries (also known as spasmodic torticollis), and is characterized as a movement disorder of the nuchal muscles, characterized by tremor or by tonic posturing of the head in a rotated, twisted, or abnormally flexed or extended position or some combination of these positions. When treated with BTX-B, high antigenicity limits long-term efficacy. Botulinum toxin a injections provide more objective and subjective benefit than trihexyphenidyl or other anticholinergic drugs to patients with cervical dystonia. Recommended: chronic low back pain, if a favorable initial response predicts subsequent responsiveness, as an option in conjunction with a functional restoration program. Some additional new data suggests that it may be effective for low back pain. (Jabbari, 2006) (Ney, 2006) Botulinum neurotoxin may be considered for low back pain (Level C). (Naumann, 2008) The requested medication is usually only indicated in the treatment of cervical dystonia. Per the California MTUS, it does not have the indication in the treatment of other diagnosis. The patient does not have this diagnosis. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

UDS: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Urine Drug Testing (UDT).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids
Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (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. Pain assessment should include current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: 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 for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. The California MTUS does recommend urine drug screens as part of the criteria for ongoing use of opioids .The patient was on opioids at the time of request and therefore the request is medically necessary.