

Case Number:	CM15-0135696		
Date Assigned:	07/23/2015	Date of Injury:	04/15/2015
Decision Date:	09/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/14/2015

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 31 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 04/15/2015. She has reported injury to the neck and upper back. The diagnoses have included acute cervical strain; rule out disc herniation; and acute thoracic strain; rule out disc herniation. Treatment to date has included medications, diagnostics, activity restrictions, and physical therapy. Medications have included Ibuprofen, Norco, Valium, Meloxicam, Tylenol No. 3, and Kera-Tek Gel. A progress report from the treating physician, dated 05/27/2015, documented an evaluation with the injured worker. Currently, the injured worker complains of intermittent neck pain radiating to her shoulders; she has stiffness in her neck; she notes tingling between her shoulder blades and weakness of her arms; the pain is aggravated by prolonged sitting and driving, sitting without any back support, reaching to shoulder height, lifting, carrying, and bending; the pain is rated at a 6/10 on the pain scale; continuous pain in her upper back, between her shoulder blades, radiating to her neck; the pain is aggravated by prolonged sitting and driving, sitting without any back support, reaching to shoulder height, lifting, carrying, and bending; and the pain is rated at a 6/10 on the pain scale. Objective findings included decreased ranges of motion of the cervical spine; palpation of the cervical paravertebral muscles revealed tenderness bilaterally; palpation of the levator scapulae revealed tenderness bilaterally and hypertonicity on the left; palpation of the trapezius revealed tenderness and hypertonicity on the left; cervical compression test and Spurling's test were positive on the left; muscle strength was 4/5 in the C5 and C6 nerve roots; decreased ranges of motion of the thoracic spine; and palpation of the thoracic paravertebral muscles revealed tenderness and hypertonicity bilaterally. The treatment plan has included the

request for MRI cervical spine; MRI thoracic spine; physical therapy 2x6 weeks; Kera-Tek Gel (Methyl Salicylate/Menthol) 4 oz.; and Tylenol No. 3 #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI Cervical Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-182. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back, Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

Decision rationale: ACOEM states "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". ODG states, "Not recommended except for indications list below. Patients who are alert, have never lost consciousness, are not under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, have no distracting injuries, have no cervical tenderness, and have no neurologic findings, do not need imaging". Indications for imaging -- MRI (magnetic resonance imaging): Chronic neck pain (after 3 months conservative treatment), radiographs normal, neurologic signs or symptoms present - Neck pain with radiculopathy if severe or progressive neurologic deficit. Chronic neck pain, radiographs show spondylosis, neurologic signs or symptoms present. Chronic neck pain, radiographs show old trauma, neurologic signs or symptoms present. Chronic neck pain, radiographs show bone or disc margin destruction. Suspected cervical spine trauma, neck pain, clinical findings suggest ligamentous injury (sprain), radiographs and/or CT "normal". Known cervical spine trauma: equivocal or positive plain films with neurological deficit. Upper back/thoracic spine trauma with neurological deficit". The treating physician has not provided evidence of red flags to meet the criteria above. As such the request for MRI of the Cervical Spine is not medically necessary.

MRI Thoracic Spine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-182. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back, Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

Decision rationale: MTUS and ACOEM recommend MRI, in general, for low back pain when "cuada equine, tumor, infection, or fracture are strongly suspected and plain film radiographs are negative, MRI test of choice for patients with prior back surgery" ACOEM additionally recommends against MRI for low back pain "before 1 month in absence of red flags". ODG

states, "Imaging is indicated only if they have severe progressive neurologic impairments or signs or symptoms indicating a serious or specific underlying condition, or if they are candidates for invasive interventions." ODG lists criteria for low back and thoracic MRI, "indications for imaging -- Magnetic resonance imaging: Thoracic spine trauma: with neurological deficit. Lumbar spine trauma: trauma, neurological deficit. Lumbar spine trauma: seat belt (chance) fracture (If focal, radicular findings or other neurologic deficit). Uncomplicated low back pain, suspicion of cancer, infection, other 'red flags'. Uncomplicated low back pain, with radiculopathy, after at least 1 month conservative therapy, sooner if severe or progressive neurologic deficit. Uncomplicated low back pain, prior lumbar surgery. Uncomplicated low back pain, cauda equina syndrome. Myelopathy (neurological deficit related to the spinal cord), traumatic. Myelopathy, painful. Myelopathy, sudden onset. Myelopathy, stepwise progressive. Myelopathy, slowly progressive. Myelopathy, infectious disease patient. Myelopathy, oncology patient. While the patient does have pain lasting greater than one month, there is no documented conservative therapy or progressive neurological deficit." The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam, objective testing, or subjective complaints) any red flags, significant worsening in symptoms or other findings suggestive of the pathologies outlined in the above guidelines. As such, the request for MRI Thoracic Spine is not medically necessary.

Physical Therapy 2x6 weeks: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 65-194, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Neck and Upper Back, Physical Therapy, ODG Preface - Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: MTUS refer to physical medicine guidelines for physical therapy and recommends as follows: "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." Additionally, ACOEM guidelines advise against passive modalities by a therapist unless exercises are to be carried out at home by patient. ODG writes regarding neck and upper back physical therapy, "Recommended. Low stress aerobic activities and stretching exercises can be initiated at home and supported by a physical therapy provider, to avoid debilitation and further restriction of motion." ODG further quantifies its cervical recommendations with Cervicalgia (neck pain); Cervical spondylosis = 9 visits over 8 weeks. Sprains and strains of neck = 10 visits over 8 weeks. Regarding physical therapy, ODG states "Patients should be formally assessed after a "six-visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted." At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. The employee has undergone prior sessions of physical therapy, but there is no detailed subjective and objective improvements and a plan for the further sessions. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Kera-Tek Gel (Methyl Salicylate/Menthol) 4 oz.: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Salicylate topicals, Topical analgesics.

Decision rationale: Kera-Tek Gel is the brand name version of a topical analgesic medication containing menthol and methyl salicylate. ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." ODG only comments on menthol in the context of cryotherapy for acute pain, but does state "Topical OTC pain relievers that contain menthol, methyl salicylate, or capsaicin, may in rare instances cause serious burns, a new alert from the FDA warns." MTUS states regarding topical Salicylate, "Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004) See also Topical analgesics; & Topical analgesics, compounded." The medical documents do not support the use of this topical compound agent. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Tylenol no. 3 #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Codeine Page(s): 35. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, (Tylenol with Codeine®).

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG state regarding codeine, "Recommended as an option for mild to moderate pain, as indicated below. Codeine is a schedule C-II controlled substance. It is similar to morphine. 60 mg of codeine is similar in potency to 600 mg of acetaminophen. It is widely used as a cough suppressant. It is used as a single agent or in combination with acetaminophen (Tylenol with Codeine) and other products for treatment of mild to moderate pain." ODG further states regarding opioid usage, "Not recommended as a first-line treatment for chronic non-malignant pain, and not recommended in patients at high risk for misuse, diversion, or substance abuse. Opioids may be recommended as a 2nd or 3rd line treatment option for chronic non-malignant pain, with caution, especially at doses over 100 mg morphine equivalent dosage/day (MED)." The medical records do not indicate what first-line treatment was tried and failed. Additionally, medical records do not detail how the patient's pain and functional level

with Tylenol with Codeine has improved. As such, the request for Tylenol with Codeine is not medically necessary.