

Case Number:	CM15-0135238		
Date Assigned:	07/22/2015	Date of Injury:	09/20/2006
Decision Date:	09/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/11/2015

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: Indiana

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 53 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 09/20/2006. The injured worker was diagnosed with discogenic lumbar disease, tendinosis of the right ankle and osteoarthritis of the left knee. The injured worker has a medical history of hypertension and diabetes mellitus. The injured worker is status post left knee surgery in 2008. Treatment to date has included diagnostic testing, surgery, physical therapy, Hyalgan injections and steroid injections to the left knee, Hyalgan injections and steroid injections to the right ankle and medications. According to the primary treating physician's progress report on June 29, 2015, the injured worker continues to experience lower back and left knee pain. Examination demonstrated tenderness to palpation across the lumbar paravertebral muscles, pain along the facets and positive facet loading tests. The left knee examination revealed pain across the medial and lateral joint line. There was pain along the ankle with mild swelling present and weakness with dorsiflexion and plantar flexion. Current medications are listed as Norco 10/325mg, Tramadol ER 150mg, Norflex 100mg, Gabapentin 600mg and Lunesta 2mg. Treatment plan consists of lumbar spine magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), continuing medication regimen and the current request for Tramadol ER 150mg, Norflex 100mg, Gabapentin 600mg, Lunesta 2mg and a left knee magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341-343. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee and Leg, MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: ACOEM notes "Special studies are not needed to evaluate most knee complaints until after a period of conservative care and observation" and "Reliance only on imaging studies to evaluate the source of knee symptoms may carry a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a problem that was present before symptoms began, and therefore has no temporal association with the current symptoms." The treating physician does not detail the failure of conservative treatment or the treatment plan for the patient's knee. Medical notes indicate that the patient is undergoing home therapy, but also additionally notes that the home therapy exercises are not being conducted. ODG further details indications for MRI: Acute trauma to the knee, including significant trauma (e.g, motor vehicle accident), or if suspect posterior knee dislocation or ligament or cartilage disruption. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adolescent: non-patellofemoral symptoms. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion) next study if clinically indicated, if additional study is needed. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adult. Patellofemoral (anterior) symptoms. Initial anteroposterior, lateral, and axial radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional imaging is necessary and if internal derangement is suspected. Non-traumatic knee pain, adult. Nontrauma, non-tumor, non-localized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional studies are indicated, and if internal derangement is suspected. Non-traumatic knee pain, adult, non-trauma, non-tumor, non-localized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs demonstrate evidence of internal derangement (e.g., Peligrini Stieda disease, joint compartment widening). Repeat MRIs: Post-surgical if need to assess knee cartilage repair tissue. (Ramappa, 2007) Routine use of MRI for follow-up of asymptomatic patients following knee arthroplasty is not recommended. (Weissman, 2011) The patient's injury is from 2006. The treating physician does not indicate additional information that would warrant a new MRI of the knee, such as post-surgical knee assessment, re-injury, or other significant change in the injury. The ODG guidelines advise against routine repeat MRI. As such, the request for MRI Left Knee is not medically necessary.

Lunesta 2mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Insomnia.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, insomnia, Mental Illness, Eszopicolone (Lunesta).

Decision rationale: MTUS is silent specifically regarding eszopicolone (Lunesta), therefore other guidelines were utilized. ODG states regarding Eszopicolone, "Not recommended for long-term use, but recommended for short-term use. See Insomnia treatment. See also the Pain Chapter. Recommend limiting use of hypnotics to three weeks maximum in the first two months of injury only, and discourage use in the chronic phase." For insomnia ODG recommends that "Pharmacological agents should only be used after careful evaluation of potential causes of sleep disturbance. Failure of sleep disturbance to resolve in a 7 to 10 day period may indicate a psychiatric and/or medical illness. (Lexi-Comp, 2008) Primary insomnia is generally addressed pharmacologically. Secondary insomnia may be treated with pharmacological and/or psychological measures. The specific component of insomnia should be addressed: (a) Sleep onset; (b) Sleep maintenance; (c) Sleep quality; & (d) Next-day functioning." Medical records do not indicate patient's sleep hygiene or the need for variance from the guidelines, such as "a) Wake at the same time everyday; (b) Maintain a consistent bedtime; (c) Exercise regularly (not within 2 to 4 hours of bedtime); (d) Perform relaxing activities before bedtime; (e) Keep your bedroom quiet and cool; (f) Do not watch the clock; (g) Avoid caffeine and nicotine for at least six hours before bed; (h) Only drink in moderation; & (i) Avoid napping." The requested quantity is in excess of the guidelines. Additionally, medical records do not indicate what components of insomnia have been addressed, treated with conservative measures, and the results of those conservative treatments. As such, the request for 1 Prescription of Eszopiclone 2mg #30 is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 600mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Title 8, effective July 18, 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs Page(s): 16-22. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for pain, Gabapentin (Neurontin®).

Decision rationale: The MTUS considers Gabapentin as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain and effective for the treatment of spinal cord injury, lumbar spinal stenosis, and post op pain. MTUS also recommends a trial of Gabapentin for complex regional pain syndrome. ODG states "Recommended Trial Period: One recommendation for an adequate trial with Gabapentin is three to eight weeks for titration, then one to two weeks at maximum tolerated dosage. (Dworkin, 2003) The patient should be asked at each visit as to whether there has been a change in pain or function. Current consensus based treatment algorithms for diabetic neuropathy suggests that if inadequate control of pain is found, a switch to another first-line drug is recommended." Additionally, ODG states that Gabapentin "has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and post herpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain." Based on the clinical documentation provided, there is no evidence of neuropathic type pain or radicular pain on exam or subjectively. As

such, without any evidence of neuropathic type pain, the medication is not medically necessary.

Nortlex 100mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Title 8, effective July 18, 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: Norflex is classified as a muscle relaxant. MTUS states, "Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement." ODG recommends limited muscle relaxant usage to 2 weeks in duration. Additionally, MTUS states "Orphenadrine (Norflex, Banflex, Antiflex, Mio-Rel, Orphenate, generic available): This drug is similar to diphenhydramine, but has greater anti-cholinergic effects. The mode of action is not clearly understood. Effects are thought to be secondary to analgesic and anticholinergic properties. This drug was approved by the FDA in 1959. Side Effects: Anti-cholinergic effects (drowsiness, urinary retention, dry mouth). Side effects may limit use in the elderly. This medication has been reported in case studies to be abused for euphoria and to have mood elevating effects. (Shariatmadari, 1975) Dosing: 100 mg twice a day; combination products are given three to four times a day. (See, 2008)" MTUS guidelines recommend against the long-term use of muscle relaxants. The treating physician has not detailed how NSAIDs is inferior to norflex, per MTUS guidelines. As written, the prescription is for 60 days of medication, which is still in excess of the recommended 2 week limit. The medical documents do not indicate extenuating circumstances to allow for exceptions to the guidelines. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Title 8, effective July 18, 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Ultram Page(s): 74-123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®).

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/acetaminophen." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient

has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. The original utilization review recommended weaning and modified the request, which is appropriate. As such, the request for tramadol is not medically necessary.