

Case Number:	CM15-0133632		
Date Assigned:	07/21/2015	Date of Injury:	03/26/2014
Decision Date:	08/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/10/2015

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, Texas, Florida

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management, Hospice & Palliative 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 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on March 26, 2014, incurring low back injuries. She was diagnosed with lumbar disc disease with herniations, lumbar stenosis and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment included physical therapy, lumbar epidural steroid injection, topical analgesic creams, pain medications, and was classified as temporarily totally disabled. Currently, the injured worker complained of constant low back pain radiating to the bilateral lower extremities, with numbness and tingling as well as a burning sensation. Range of motion of the lumbar spine was noted as being restricted. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included physical therapy to the lumbar spine, and prescriptions for Ultracet, and compound creams.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy 8 visits to the lumbar spine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 298, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 98. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back Chapter, Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the request exceeds the amount of PT recommended by the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In the absence of such documentation, the current request for physical therapy is not medically necessary.

Ultracet 37.5/325mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter (Online version).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultracet (tramadol/acetaminophen), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Ultracet 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 Ultracet (tramadol/acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

Flurbi/Keto/Keta 20/20/10% 120gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_0351-0400/ab_378_bill_20110908_amended_sen_v84.html.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Flurbi/Keto/Keta 20/20/10% 120gm, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Topical NSAIDs are indicated for "Osteoarthritis and tendonitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use." Topical ketamine is "Only recommended for treatment of neuropathic pain in refractory cases in which all primary and secondary treatment has been exhausted." Within the documentation available for review, none of the abovementioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient, despite guideline recommendations. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Flurbi/Keto/Keta 20/20/10% 120gm is not medically necessary.

Gaba/Cyclo/Caps 10/10/0.037 5% 120 gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_0351-0400/ab_378_bill_20110908_amended_sen_v84.html.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Gaba/Cyclo/Caps 10/10/0.037 5% 120 gm, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Capsaicin is "Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." Muscle relaxants drugs are not supported by the CA MTUS for topical use. Regarding topical gabapentin, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that topical anti-epileptic medications are not recommended. They go on to state that there is no peer-reviewed literature to support their use. Within the documentation available for review, none of the abovementioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient, despite guideline recommendations. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Gaba/Cyclo/Caps 10/10/0.037 5% 120 gm is not medically necessary.