MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0133817		
Date Assigned:	07/22/2015	Date of Injury:	11/19/2014
Decision Date:	09/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/29/2015
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: 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 60 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/19/2014. The mechanism of injury was due to constant pulling. The injured worker was diagnosed as having thoracic and lumbar sprain/strain. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included trigger point injections, physical therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 6/16/2015, the injured worker complains of thoracic and lumbar pain, rated 8-9/10 and difficulty sleeping. Physical examination showed thoracic and lumbar tenderness and decreased range of motion. The treating physician is requesting Tramadol 150 mg #30, Naproxen 550 mg #90, Pantoprazole 20 mg #60, thoracic spine x ray and 8 sessions of physical therapy for the thoracic spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 150mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids; Tramadol (Ultram) Page(s): 78-80, 113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 12, 13, 83 and 113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Tramadol is an opiate analogue medication, not recommended as a first-line therapy. The MTUS based on Cochrane studies found very small pain improvements, and adverse events caused participants to discontinue the medicine. Most important, there are no long-term studies to allow it to be recommended for use past six months. A long-term use of is therefore not supported. The request is not medically necessary.

Naproxen 550mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-Inflammatory Medications; NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 22, 67.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 60 and 67 of 127.

Decision rationale: The MTUS recommends NSAID medication for osteoarthritis and pain at the lowest dose, and the shortest period possible. The guides cite that there is no reason to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. Further, the MTUS cites 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, and moreover, to recommend this medicine instead of simple over the counter NSAID. The medicine is not medically necessary.

Pantoprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68 of 127.

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 not medically necessary based on MTUS guideline review.

Thoracic Spine-X-Ray: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 165, 287. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back, Radiography (x-rays).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004), The California MTUS-ACOEM guides, specifically Chapter 12 for the back, note on page 303.

Decision rationale: In regards to spine x-rays in general, the MTUS notes that the criteria for ordering imaging studies are: emergence of a red flag, physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery and clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. The patient does not meet these criteria. Further, unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. In this case, there is no documentation of equivocal neurologic signs. Further, imaging studies to this area had already been accomplished, and the reason for repeating the study is not clinically clear. The request was not medically necessary.

Physical Therapy 2x4 - Thoracic Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 98 of 127.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does permit physical therapy in chronic situations, noting that one should allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. The conditions mentioned are Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks; Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks; and Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. This claimant does not have these conditions. In addition, after several documented sessions of therapy, it is not clear why the patient would not be independent with self-care at this point. In addition, there are especially strong caveats in the MTUS/ACOEM guidelines against over treatment in the chronic situation supporting the clinical notion that the move to independence and an active, independent home program is clinically in the best interest of the patient. They cite: Although mistreating or under treating pain is of concern, an even greater risk for the physician is over treating the chronic pain patient. Over-treatment often results in irreparable harm to the patient's socioeconomic status, home life, personal relationships, and quality of life in general. A patient's complaints of pain should be acknowledged. Patient and clinician should remain focused on the ultimate goal of rehabilitation leading to optimal functional recovery, decreased healthcare utilization, and maximal self-actualization. This request for more skilled, monitored therapy was not medically necessary.