

Case Number:	CM15-0138462		
Date Assigned:	07/28/2015	Date of Injury:	11/04/2013
Decision Date:	09/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/16/2015

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: Connecticut, California, Virginia
 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 37 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 11/04/13. Initial complaints and diagnoses are not available. Treatments to date include medications. Diagnostic studies are not addressed. Current complaints include neck, mid and lower back pain rated at 8-9/10. Current diagnoses include brachial neuritis or radiculitis, thoracic sprain, thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis, headache, psychosexual dysfunction, dsythymic disorder and insomnia. In a progress note dated 05/14/15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as a MRI of the lumbar spine, physical therapy to the lumbar spine, medications including Fexmid, Ultram, Naproxen, Prilosec, Lunesta, Norco, and a compound topical of Cyclobenzaprine, tramadol, and Flurbiprofen. The requested treatments include a MRI of the lumbar spine, physical therapy to the lumbar spine, medications including Tramadol, Lunesta, hydrocodone, and a compound topical of Cyclobenzaprine, tramadol, and Flurbiprofen.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar MRI: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303-304.

Decision rationale: The MTUS discusses recommendations for MRI in unequivocal findings of specific nerve compromise on physical exam, in patients who do not respond to treatment, and who would consider surgery an option. Absent red flags or clear indications for surgery, a clear indication for MRI is not supported by the provided documents. Physical therapy has also been requested, and therefore the patient cannot be considered as having failed conservative treatment. Without further indication for imaging, the request for MRI is not medically necessary.

Physical therapy for lumbar spine 2 x week for 6 weeks: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines manual therapy and manipulation Page(s): 58-59.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Chronic Pain Management Guidelines (pg 58-59) indicate that manual therapy and manipulation are recommended as options in low back pain. With respect to therapeutic care, the MTUS recommends a trial of 6 visits over 2 weeks, with evidence of objective functional improvement allowing for up to 18 visits over 6-8 weeks. If the case is considered a recurrence/flare-up, the guidelines similarly indicate a need to evaluate treatment success. In either case, whether considered acute or recurrent, the patient needs to be evaluated for functional improvement prior to the completion of 12 visits in order to meet the standards outlined in the guidelines. Overall, it is quite possible the patient may benefit from conservative treatment with manual therapy at this time. However, early re-evaluation for efficacy of treatment/functional improvement is critical. The guidelines indicate a time to produce effect of 4-6 treatments, making the modification to 10 visits more than reasonable, which provides a reasonable timeline by which to reassess the patient and ensure that education, counseling, and evaluation for functional improvement occur. In this case, the request for a total of 12 visits to physical therapy without a definitive plan to assess for added clinical benefit prior to completion of the entire course of therapy is not medically necessary.

Tramadol HCL ER 150mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, specific drug list - Tramadol Page(s): 93-94.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 74-96.

Decision rationale: Chronic use of opioids is addressed thoroughly by the MTUS chronic pain guidelines and given the long history of pain in this patient since the initial date of injury, consideration of the MTUS Criteria for Use of Opioids in chronic pain is appropriate. Documentation of pain and functional improvement are critical components, along with

documentation of adverse effects. While the MTUS does not specifically detail a set visit frequency for re-evaluation, recommended duration between visits is 1 to 6 months. In this case, the patient clearly warrants close monitoring and treatment, to include close follow up regarding improvement in pain/function; consideration of additional expertise in pain management should be considered if there is no evidence of improvement in the long term. More detailed consideration of long-term treatment goals for pain (specifically aimed at decreased need for opioids), and further elaboration on dosing expectations in this case would be valuable. Consideration of other pain treatment modalities and adjuvants is also recommended. Utilization Review reasonably modified the request to facilitate appropriate weaning. Given the lack of clear evidence to support functional improvement on the medication and the chronic risk of continued treatment, the request for opioids is not medically necessary.

Lunesta 3mg #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 (ODG), Online Version - Insomnia treatment.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) mental illness and stress, and Lunesta.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS does not specifically address use of Lunesta; therefore the ODG provides the preferred mechanism for assessment of clinical necessity in this case. The ODG recommends limiting use of hypnotics like Lunesta to three weeks maximum in the first two months of injury only, and discourages use in the chronic phase. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers, and anti-anxiety agents are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. They can be habit-forming, and they may impair function and memory more than opioid pain relievers. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary at this time.

Cyclobenzaprine 10%/Tramadol 10%, Flurbiprofen 25% topical cream: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesia Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The MTUS guidelines on Topical Analgesics describe topical treatment as an option; however, topicals are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. The MTUS states specifically that any compound product that contains at least one drug (or class) that is not recommended is not recommended. Cyclobenzaprine is not recommended as a topical ingredient by the MTUS, and therefore the request for a compound containing Cyclobenzaprine for topical use is not medically necessary.

Hydrocodone/APAP 10/325mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen Page(s): 91-92.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 74-96.

Decision rationale: Chronic use of opioids is addressed thoroughly by the MTUS chronic pain guidelines and given the long history of pain in this patient since the initial date of injury, consideration of the MTUS Criteria for Use of Opioids in chronic pain is appropriate. Documentation of pain and functional improvement are critical components, along with documentation of adverse effects. While the MTUS does not specifically detail a set visit frequency for re-evaluation, recommended duration between visits is 1 to 6 months. In this case, the patient clearly warrants close monitoring and treatment, to include close follow up regarding improvement in pain/function; consideration of additional expertise in pain management should be considered if there is no evidence of improvement in the long term. More detailed consideration of long-term treatment goals for pain (specifically aimed at decreased need for opioids), and further elaboration on dosing expectations in this case would be valuable. Consideration of other pain treatment modalities and adjuvants is also recommended. Utilization Review reasonably modified the request to facilitate appropriate weaning. Given the lack of clear evidence to support functional improvement on the medication and the chronic risk of continued treatment, the request for opioids is not medically necessary.