

Case Number:	CM15-0144804		
Date Assigned:	08/05/2015	Date of Injury:	06/03/2011
Decision Date:	09/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/27/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 65 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 06/03/2011. Mechanism of injury occurred when she was hit in the side of her head by a basketball by one of the students inadvertently. Diagnoses include neck pain, cervical headache, cervical spinal stenosis-severe right sided foraminal stenosis, headache-post traumatic, and depression with anxiety. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, medications, physical therapy, use of a Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation unit, acupuncture, status post anterior cervical discectomy and fusion C5-C6 on 02-18-2015, and cervical epidural injections. Her medications include a half tab of Norco and a half tab of Cyclobenzaprine at night. Her medications help to relieve her pain and help her to sleep at night. The cervical spine range of motion is restricted and painful. She has tenderness to palpation of the right cervicobrachial region, right cervical paraspinal musculature as well as pain in the trapezius region. An unofficial Magnetic Resonance Imaging report of the cervical spine done on 09-17-2013 showed severe facet hypertrophy on the right at C3-4 and C4-5 contributing to asymmetric right-sided foraminal stenosis, and a 1mm central disc protrusions at C2-3, C3-4, C4-5 and are causing trace central stenosis. A physician progress note dated 07/06/2015 documents the injured worker complains of increased and constant neck pain, which she rates as 8 out of 10. She states her pain has been unchanged since undergoing her surgery. Her medications help to relieve her pain and help her to sleep at night. The cervical spine range of motion is restricted and painful. She has tenderness to palpation of the right cervicobrachial region, right cervical paraspinal musculature as well as pain in the trapezius region. Treatment requested is for a Functional Restoration program x 1.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Functional restoration program x 1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain, Chronic Pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs) Page(s): 31-33.

Decision rationale: Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs) Recommended where there is access to programs with proven successful outcomes, for patients with conditions that put them at risk of delayed recovery. Patients should also be motivated to improve and return to work, and meet the patient selection criteria outlined below. Also called Multidisciplinary pain programs or Interdisciplinary rehabilitation programs, these pain rehabilitation programs combine multiple treatments, and at the least, include psychological care along with physical therapy & occupational therapy (including an active exercise component as opposed to passive modalities). While recommended, the research remains ongoing as to (1) what is considered the "gold-standard" content for treatment; (2) the group of patients that benefit most from this treatment; (3) the ideal timing of when to initiate treatment; (4) the intensity necessary for effective treatment; and (5) cost-effectiveness. It has been suggested that interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary care models for treatment of chronic pain may be the most effective way to treat this condition. Unfortunately, being a claimant may be a predictor of poor long-term outcomes. (Robinson, 2004) These treatment modalities are based on the biopsychosocial model, one that views pain and disability in terms of the interaction between physiological, psychological and social factors. (Gatchel, 2005) There appears to be little scientific evidence for the effectiveness of multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation compared with other rehabilitation facilities for neck and shoulder pain, as opposed to low back pain and generalized pain syndromes. (Karjalainen, 2003) Predictors of success and failure: As noted, one of the criticisms of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary rehabilitation programs is the lack of an appropriate screening tool to help to determine who will most benefit from this treatment. Retrospective research has examined decreased rates of completion of functional restoration programs, and there is ongoing research to evaluate screening tools prior to entry. (Gatchel, 2006) The following variables have been found to be negative predictors of efficacy of treatment with the programs as well as negative predictors of completion of the programs: (1) a negative relationship with the employer/supervisor; (2) poor work adjustment and satisfaction; (3) a negative outlook about future employment; (4) high levels of psychosocial distress (higher pretreatment levels of depression, pain and disability); (5) involvement in financial disability disputes; (6) greater rates of smoking; (7) duration of pre-referral disability time; (8) prevalence of opioid use; and (9) pretreatment levels of pain. (Linton, 2001) (Bendix, 1998) (McGeary, 2006) (McGeary, 2004) (Gatchel, 2005) Multidisciplinary treatment strategies are effective for patients with chronic low back pain (CLBP) in all stages of chronicity and should not

only be given to those with lower grades of CLBP, according to the results of a prospective longitudinal clinical study reported in the December 15 issue of Spine. (Buchner, 2007) See also Chronic pain programs, early intervention; Chronic pain programs, intensity; Chronic pain programs, opioids; and Functional restoration programs. Criteria for the general use of multidisciplinary pain management programs: Outpatient pain rehabilitation programs may be considered medically necessary when all of the following criteria are met: 1) An adequate and thorough evaluation has been made, including baseline functional testing so follow-up with the same test can note functional improvement; (2) Previous methods of treating chronic pain have been unsuccessful and there is an absence of other options likely to result in significant clinical improvement; (3) The patient has a significant loss of ability to function independently resulting from the chronic pain; (4) The patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted (if a goal of treatment is to prevent or avoid controversial or optional surgery, a trial of 10 visits may be implemented to assess whether surgery may be avoided); (5) The patient exhibits motivation to change, and is willing to forgo secondary gains, including disability payments to effect this change; & (6) Negative predictors of success above have been addressed. In this case, there is no evidence of significant loss of function and/or failure of previous treatment methods. In addition, there is no evidence that a psychological evaluation has taken place to support the referral to a restoration program. Therefore, the request for functional restoration program is not medically necessary.