MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0139923		
Date Assigned:	07/29/2015	Date of Injury:	10/31/2013
Decision Date:	09/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/20/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 71-year-old male sustained an industrial injury on 10/31/13. Diagnoses include sprain of shoulder and arm. The injured worker continues to experience left shoulder, left hand, mid to low back and bilateral knee pain. Upon examination, there was tenderness, decreased motion, decreased sensation and decreased grip strengths noted. The plan of care includes x-ray testing, physical therapy, a back brace and prescription medications. Retrospective request for 1 Urine Drug Test Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015, Retrospective request for 1 Opioids Narcotics Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015, Retrospective request for 1 Compound Cream Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015, Retrospective request for 1 X-Ray Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015, Retrospective request for 1 MRI Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015 and Retrospective request for 1 ESWT Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015 were made by the treating physician.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective request for 1 Urine Drug Test Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Education Page(s): 44.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of pamphlet or web based education. With regard to education, the MTUS states: Recommended. On-going education of the patient and family, as well as the employer, insurer, policy makers and the community should be the primary emphasis in the treatment of chronic pain. Currently, practitioners often think of education last, after medications, manual therapy and surgery. Practitioners must develop and implement an effective strategy and skills to educate patients, employers, insurance systems, policy makers and the community as a whole. An education-based paradigm should always start with inexpensive communication providing reassuring information to the patient. The documentation did not provide any rationale as to why the injured worker was unable to participate in traditional education by the provider. There was no evidence cited supporting the use of web based education or pamphlets. The request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for 1 Opioids Narcotics Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Education Page(s): 44.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of pamphlet or web based education. With regard to education, the MTUS states: Recommended. On-going education of the patient and family, as well as the employer, insurer, policy makers and the community should be the primary emphasis in the treatment of chronic pain. Currently, practitioners often think of education last, after medications, manual therapy and surgery. Practitioners must develop and implement an effective strategy and skills to educate patients, employers, insurance systems, policy makers and the community as a whole. An education-based paradigm should always start with inexpensive communication providing reassuring information to the patient. The documentation did not provide any rationale as to why the injured worker was unable to participate in traditional education by the provider. There was no evidence cited supporting the use of web based education or pamphlets. The request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for 1 Compound Cream Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Education Page(s): 44.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of pamphlet or web based education. With regard to education, the MTUS states: Recommended. On-going education of the patient and family, as well as the employer, insurer, policy makers and the community should be the primary emphasis in the treatment of chronic pain. Currently, practitioners often think of education last, after medications, manual therapy and surgery. Practitioners must develop and implement an effective strategy and skills to educate patients, employers, insurance systems, policy makers and the community as a whole. An education-based paradigm should always start with inexpensive communication providing reassuring information to the patient. The documentation did not provide any rationale as to why the injured worker was unable to participate in traditional education by the provider. There was no evidence cited supporting the use of web based education or pamphlets. The request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for 1 X-Ray Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Education Page(s): 44.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of pamphlet or web based education. With regard to education, the MTUS states: Recommended. On-going education of the patient and family, as well as the employer, insurer, policy makers and the community should be the primary emphasis in the treatment of chronic pain. Currently, practitioners often think of education last, after medications, manual therapy and surgery. Practitioners must develop and implement an effective strategy and skills to educate patients, employers, insurance systems, policy makers and the community as a whole. An education-based paradigm should always start with inexpensive communication providing reassuring information to the patient. The documentation did not provide any rationale as to why the injured worker was unable to participate in traditional education by the provider. There was no evidence cited supporting the use of web based education or pamphlets. The request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for 1 MRI Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Education Page(s): 44.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of pamphlet or web based education. With regard to education, the MTUS states: Recommended. On-going education of the patient and family, as well as the employer, insurer, policy makers and the community should be the primary emphasis in the treatment of chronic pain. Currently, practitioners often think of education last, after medications, manual therapy and surgery. Practitioners must develop and implement an effective strategy and skills to educate patients, employers, insurance systems, policy makers and the community as a whole. An education-based paradigm should always start with inexpensive communication providing reassuring information to the patient. The documentation did not provide any rationale as to why the injured worker was unable to participate in traditional education by the provider. There was no evidence cited supporting the use of web based education or pamphlets. The request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for 1 ESWT Education pamphlet/web based education between 5/18/2015 and 6/1/2015: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Education Page(s): 44.

Decision rationale: The MTUS and ODG are silent on the use of pamphlet or web based education. With regard to education, the MTUS states: Recommended. On-going education of the patient and family, as well as the employer, insurer, policy makers and the community should be the primary emphasis in the treatment of chronic pain. Currently, practitioners often think of education last, after medications, manual therapy and surgery. Practitioners must develop and implement an effective strategy and skills to educate patients, employers, insurance systems, policy makers and the community as a whole. An education-based paradigm should always start with inexpensive communication providing reassuring information to the patient. The documentation did not provide any rationale as to why the injured worker was unable to participate in traditional education by the provider. There was no evidence cited supporting the use of web based education or pamphlets. The request is not medically necessary.