

Case Number:	CM15-0181827		
Date Assigned:	09/23/2015	Date of Injury:	07/12/2001
Decision Date:	11/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/15/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency 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 69 year old female who sustained an injury on 7-12-01 resulting from repetitive trauma and developed carpal tunnel syndrome. She had carpal tunnel releases on 7-3-02 on the left and the right one on 4-22-02 and was diagnosed with bilateral trigger fingers in 2002. She had injections that were unsuccessful and eventually had bilateral trigger finger releases on 11-6-02. Treatment has included extensive occupational therapy, medications and topical cream. The medical records on 2-4-15 indicate she was not working, retired and pain was worse with driving and treatment included ice versus heat; brace, injections help and to refill Norco 10-325 mg as needed and to consider repeat electromyography and nerve conduction studies and states she is compliant with her medication. Norco 10-325 mg #30 as needed was noted since at least 3-18-15. The progress report on 8-18-15 indicates the same complaints and treatment included Norco 10-325 mg #30 as needed (usually once daily) and was currently out. Objective findings were tenderness to palpation base of left thumb; triggers of fingers stable and unchanged. The treatment plans included consider repeat injection as needed; Norco #30 as previously written and approved x 60 days. The records indicate it gives activities of daily living and increases range of motion. Current requested treatments Norco 10-325mg; right and left upper extremity electromyography; right upper extremity nerve conduction study. Utilization review 8-25-15 recommends modify Norco 10-325 mg (#30 with 3 refills) and deny other requested treatments.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the opioid class. The MTUS guidelines state that for ongoing treatment with a pharmaceutical in this class, certain requirements are necessary. This includes not only adequate pain control, but also functional improvement. Four domains have been proposed for management of patients on opioids. This includes pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. In this case, there is inadequate documentation of persistent functional improvement seen. As such, the request is not medically necessary. All opioid medications should be titrated down slowly in order to prevent a significant withdrawal syndrome.

Right upper extremity EMG: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and upper back/EMGs (electromyography).

Decision rationale: The request is for an EMG. The ODG state the following regarding this topic: Recommended (needle, not surface) as an option in selected cases. The American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine conducted a review on electrodiagnosis in relation to cervical radiculopathy and concluded that the test was moderately sensitive (50%-71%) and highly specific (65%-85%). (AAEM, 1999) EMG findings may not be predictive of surgical outcome in cervical surgery, and patients may still benefit from surgery even in the absence of EMG findings of nerve root impingement. This is in stark contrast to the lumbar spine where EMG findings have been shown to be highly correlative with symptoms. Indications when particularly helpful: EMG may be helpful for patients with double crush phenomenon, in particular, when there is evidence of possible metabolic pathology such as neuropathy secondary to diabetes or thyroid disease, or evidence of peripheral compression such as carpal tunnel syndrome. In this case, the patient does not meet criteria for the study requested. This is secondary to poor physical exam findings suggestive of peripheral nerve compression. Pending receipt of information further clarifying how this study would change the management rendered, the study is not medically necessary.

Left upper extremity EMG: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and upper back/EMGs (electromyography).

Decision rationale: The request is for an EMG. The ODG state the following regarding this topic: Recommended (needle, not surface) as an option in selected cases. The American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine conducted a review on electrodiagnosis in relation to cervical radiculopathy and concluded that the test was moderately sensitive (50%-71%) and highly specific (65%-85%). (AAEM, 1999) EMG findings may not be predictive of surgical outcome in cervical surgery, and patients may still benefit from surgery even in the absence of EMG findings of nerve root impingement. This is in stark contrast to the lumbar spine where EMG findings have been shown to be highly correlative with symptoms. Indications when particularly helpful: EMG may be helpful for patients with double crush phenomenon, in particular, when there is evidence of possible metabolic pathology such as neuropathy secondary to diabetes or thyroid disease, or evidence of peripheral compression such as carpal tunnel syndrome. In this case, the patient does not meet criteria for the study requested. This is secondary to poor physical exam findings suggestive of peripheral nerve compression. Pending receipt of information further clarifying how this study would change the management rendered, the study is not medically necessary.

Right upper extremity NCS: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and upper back/Nerve conduction studies.

Decision rationale: The request is for nerve conduction studies. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue. The ODG states the following: Not recommended to demonstrate radiculopathy if radiculopathy has already been clearly identified by EMG and obvious clinical signs, but recommended if the EMG is not clearly radiculopathy or clearly negative, or to differentiate radiculopathy from other neuropathies or non-neuropathic processes if other diagnoses may be likely based on the clinical exam. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is already presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. (Utah, 2006) (Lin, 2013) While cervical electrodiagnostic studies are not necessary to demonstrate a cervical radiculopathy, they have been suggested to confirm a brachial plexus abnormality, diabetic neuropathy, or some problem other than a cervical radiculopathy, with caution that these studies can result in unnecessary over treatment. (Emad, 2010) (Plastaras, 2011) (Lo, 2011) (Fuglsang-Frederiksen, 2011) See also the Shoulder Chapter, where nerve conduction studies are recommended for the diagnosis of TOS (thoracic outlet

syndrome). Also see the Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Chapter for more details on NCS. Studies have not shown portable nerve conduction devices to be effective. In this case, the use of this diagnostic test is not supported. This is secondary to poor documentation of peripheral nerve compromise necessitating further clarity. There is also inadequate discussion of how the result of this study would change the clinical management. Pending receipt of this information, the request is not medically necessary.

Left upper extremity NCS: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and upper back/Nerve conduction studies.

Decision rationale: The request is for nerve conduction studies. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue. The ODG states the following: Not recommended to demonstrate radiculopathy if radiculopathy has already been clearly identified by EMG and obvious clinical signs, but recommended if the EMG is not clearly radiculopathy or clearly negative, or to differentiate radiculopathy from other neuropathies or non-neuropathic processes if other diagnoses may be likely based on the clinical exam. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is already presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. (Utah, 2006) (Lin, 2013) While cervical electrodiagnostic studies are not necessary to demonstrate a cervical radiculopathy, they have been suggested to confirm a brachial plexus abnormality, diabetic neuropathy, or some problem other than a cervical radiculopathy, with caution that these studies can result in unnecessary over treatment. (Emad, 2010) (Plastaras, 2011) (Lo, 2011) (Fuglsang-Frederiksen, 2011) See also the Shoulder Chapter, where nerve conduction studies are recommended for the diagnosis of TOS (thoracic outlet syndrome). Also see the Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Chapter for more details on NCS. Studies have not shown portable nerve conduction devices to be effective. In this case, the use of this diagnostic test is not supported. This is secondary to poor documentation of peripheral nerve compromise necessitating further clarity. There is also inadequate discussion of how the result of this study would change the clinical management. Pending receipt of this information, the request is not medically necessary.