

Case Number:	CM15-0133321		
Date Assigned:	07/21/2015	Date of Injury:	10/31/2011
Decision Date:	08/26/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/10/2015
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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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:

The injured worker is a 52 year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 10/31/11. She reported back pain. Previous diagnoses included herniated protruded disc at L4/5, L5/S1, and lumbar radiculitis. Diagnostic testing and treatment to date has included electrodiagnostic consultation, discogram, lumbar/sacroiliac/trigger point injections 10/2014, physical therapy, urine toxicology screen, and pain medication management. Current diagnoses include status post L/S herniated disc, and L/S radiculopathy. In reference to progress notes dated 03/11/15 and 04/13/15, the injured worker complains her low pain remains the same, and rates the pain as an 8 on a 10 point pain scale; the pain radiates down her left leg with numbness and tingling. She reports she did better after past lumbosacral injections. Physical examination of the lumbosacral spine is remarkable for spasms and decreased range of motion, and she has reduced sensation over the right sacroiliac joint. Requested treatments include bilateral SI joint injections, Cymbalta 30mg #30, Ultram 50mg #90, Naproxen 500mg #60. The injured worker is under temporary total disability. Date of Utilization Review: 06/10/15.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bilateral SI joint injections: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Hip & Pelvis, sacroiliac joint blocks.

Decision rationale: The MTUS is silent on the use of sacroiliac joint injections. Per ODG TWC with regard to sacroiliac joint injections: "Recommended as an option if failed at least 4-6 weeks of aggressive conservative therapy as indicated below." Criteria for the use of sacroiliac blocks: 1. The history and physical should suggest the diagnosis (with documentation of at least 3 positive exam findings as listed above). 2. Diagnostic evaluation must first address any other possible pain generators. 3. The patient has had and failed at least 4-6 weeks of aggressive conservative therapy including PT, home exercise and medication management. 4. Blocks are performed under fluoroscopy. (Hansen, 2003) 5. A positive diagnostic response is recorded as 80% for the duration of the local anesthetic. If the first block is not positive, a second diagnostic block is not performed. 6. If steroids are injected during the initial injection, the duration of pain relief should be at least 6 weeks with at least > 70% pain relief recorded for this period. 7. In the treatment or therapeutic phase (after the stabilization is completed), the suggested frequency for repeat blocks is 2 months or longer between each injection, provided that at least >70% pain relief is obtained for 6 weeks. 8. The block is not to be performed on the same day as a lumbar epidural steroid injection (ESI), transforaminal ESI, facet joint injection or medial branch block. 9. In the treatment or therapeutic phase, the interventional procedures should be repeated only as necessary judging by the medical necessity criteria, and these should be limited to a maximum of 4 times for local anesthetic and steroid blocks over a period of 1 year. The documentation submitted for review did not contain 3 positive exam findings; Cranial Shear Test; Extension Test; Flamingo Test; Fortin Finger Test; Gaenslen's Test; Gillet's Test (One Legged-Stork Test); Patrick's Test (FABER); Pelvic Compression Test; Pelvic Distraction Test; Pelvic Rock Test; Resisted Abduction Test (REAB); Sacroiliac Shear Test; Standing Flexion Test; Seated Flexion Test; Thigh Thrust Test (POSH) suggesting the diagnosis of SI joint dysfunction. As the criteria was not met, the request is not medically necessary.

Cymbalta 30mg #30: Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antidepressants for chronic pain Page(s): 13.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS CPMTG with regard to the use of antidepressants for chronic pain: "Recommended as a first line option for neuropathic pain, and as a possibility for non-neuropathic pain. (Feuerstein, 1997) (Perrot, 2006) Tricyclics are generally considered a first-line agent unless they are ineffective, poorly tolerated, or contraindicated. Analgesia generally occurs within a few days to a week, whereas antidepressant effect takes longer to occur. Assessment of treatment efficacy should include not only pain outcomes, but also an evaluation of function, changes in use of other analgesic medication, sleep quality and duration, and

psychological assessment." I respectfully disagree with the UR physician's assertion that the documentation submitted for review did not contain findings consistent with neuropathic pain. Per progress notes dated 03/11/15 and 04/13/15, the injured worker complained her pain remained the same, and rated the pain as an 8 on a 10 point pain scale; the pain radiated down her left leg with numbness and tingling. The request is medically necessary.

Ultram 50mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Ongoing opioid management.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "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 any 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." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Ultram nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the ongoing management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends discontinuing opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, the request is not medically necessary.

Naproxen 500mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68.

Decision rationale: With regard to the use of NSAIDs for chronic low back pain, the MTUS CPMTG states "Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle

relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another." "Low back pain (chronic): Both acetaminophen and NSAIDs have been recommended as first line therapy for low back pain. There is insufficient evidence to recommend one medication over the other. Selection should be made on a case-by-case basis based on weighing efficacy vs. side effect profile." The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker has using this medication since 1/2015. As it is only recommended for short-term symptomatic relief, the request is not medically necessary.