

Case Number:	CM15-0186149		
Date Assigned:	10/06/2015	Date of Injury:	06/10/2015
Decision Date:	12/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/22/2015

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 19 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 10, 2015, incurring multiple injuries to the back, neck, right hand and right foot. He was diagnosed with cervical spine sprain, cervical radiculopathy, cervical disc displacement, closed fracture of the lumbar vertebra, thoracic spine sprain, thoracic spine compression fracture, thoracic spine herniation, lumbar disc displacement and herniation, lumbar spine sprain, foot sprain and ankle internal derangement, hand sprain, and hand internal derangement. Treatment included anti-inflammatory drugs, pain medications, neuropathic medications, muscle relaxants, topical analgesic creams, transcutaneous electrical stimulation unit, diagnostic imaging, and work modifications and activity restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complained of burning radicular neck pain and spasms rated 7 out of 10 on a pain scale from 0 to 10. He noted numbness and tingling of the upper extremities, burning in the right hand, fingers, lower extremities, back and right foot. He had reduced range of motion of the cervical neck. His pain was aggravated by prolonged positioning including sitting, standing, walking and bending. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization on September 18, 2015, included prescriptions for Deprizine, Dicopanol, Fanatrex, Synapryn, Tabradol, Cyclobenzaprine, Ketoprofen cream, one urine drug screen, one x ray of the cervical spine, transcutaneous electrical stimulation unit with supplies, one hot and cold unit, three shockwave therapy visits for the cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine, one Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the cervical spine, one Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the thoracic spine, one Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the lumbar spine, one Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the right wrist, one Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the right foot, one Nerve Conduction Velocity-Electromyography study

of the bilateral upper extremities and one Nerve Conduction Velocity-Electromyography study of the bilateral lower extremities. On September 8, 2015, requests for the above prescriptions, Magnetic Resonance Imaging's, testing and supplies were denied by utilization review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Unknown prescription of Deprizine: 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) Pain (Chronic)/Compounded drugs.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication. The official disability guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA approved ingredients may be considered. (Wynn, 2011) See specific entries for each ingredient. See also topical analgesics, compounded. Pharmacy compounding has traditionally involved combining drug ingredients to meet the needs of specific patients for medications that are not otherwise commercially available, and it is undertaken on a patient-by-patient basis for patients who, for example, might be allergic to inactive ingredients in FDA approved drugs or may need a different dosage strength or route of administration. Unlike commercially available drugs, these products are not approved by the FDA but rather are regulated by the state pharmacy board and state law governing the practice of pharmacy. The FDA does not regulate pharmacy-compounded products in recognition of the important public health function performed by traditional compounding. Recently, some pharmacies have been making and marketing stock compound drugs for the WC patient population. Among the FDA "Red Flags" for Enforcement Action on Compounded Drugs is: "Compounding drugs in anticipation of receiving prescriptions, except in very limited quantities in relation to amounts compounded after receiving valid prescriptions." (FDA, 2011) Compound topical analgesics may provide relief by acting locally over the painful site with lower risk of systemic adverse effects on the gastrointestinal system and drug interactions than oral NSAIDs. The issues surrounding compound drugs are due to uncertainties regarding whether the products are medically appropriate and whether payments are reasonable, with the latter issue possibly also involving who dispenses the drug. Medical necessity should be based on the patient's needs combined with the medical and scientific evidence presented in ODG. ODG does not address pricing and fee schedules, but in general there should be consistency within a pharmacy fee schedule for products containing the same active ingredients, so that there is not an inappropriate incentive to use compounding. (Wynn, 2011) See also Co-pack drugs; Medical foods; Physician-dispensed drugs; Repackaged drugs; & Topical analgesics, compounded. Criteria for Compound drugs: (1) Include at least one drug substance (or active ingredient) that is the sole active ingredient in an FDA approved prescription drug, not including OTC drugs. (2) Include

only bulk ingredients that are components of FDA-approved drugs that have been made in an FDA registered facility and have an NDC code. (3) Is not a drug that was withdrawn or removed from the market for safety reasons. (4) Is not a copy of a commercially available FDA approved drug product. (5) Include only drug substances that have been supported as safe and effective for the prescribed indication by the FDA approval process and/or by adequate medical and scientific evidence in the medical literature. This would allow off-label usage when supported by medical evidence. See specific entries for each ingredient in ODG for the medical and scientific evidence. (6) Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The use of compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. See also topical analgesics, compounded. (Wynn, 2011) As stated above the use of this medication is not indicated. This is secondary to no documentation which states that there has been a failure of first-line FDA approved drug therapy or any explanation as to why this compounded formula is superior in efficacy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Dicoprofanol: 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) Mental Illness and Stress/Diphenhydramine (Benadryl).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of Diphenhydramine which is in the category of an antihistamine. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this topic. The ODG states the following regarding its use: Not recommended. See Insomnia treatment, where sedating antihistamines are not recommended for long-term insomnia treatment. The AGS updated Beers criteria for inappropriate medication use includes diphenhydramine. (AGS, 2012) Anticholinergic drugs, including diphenhydramine, may increase the risk for dementia by 50% in older adults. There is an obvious dose-response relationship between anticholinergic drug use and risk of developing dementia, but chronic use, even at low doses, would be in the highest risk category. While there is awareness that these drugs may cause short-term drowsiness or confusion, which is included in the prescribing information, there is no mention of long-term effects on cognition, and generally awareness of this issue is very low, and both the public and doctors need to be encouraged to use alternative treatments where possible. (Gray, 2015) As stated above, the use of this medication is not indicated for use in this patient for insomnia. There is inadequate documentation of the reasoning for its use for other indications. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Fanatrex: 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) Pain (Chronic)/Compounded drugs.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication. The official disability guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Not recommended as a first-line therapy. In general, commercially available, FDA approved drugs should be given an adequate trial. If these are found to be ineffective or are contraindicated in individual patients, compound drugs that use FDA approved ingredients may be considered. (Wynn, 2011) See specific entries for each ingredient. See also topical analgesics, compounded. Pharmacy compounding has traditionally involved combining drug ingredients to meet the needs of specific patients for medications that are not otherwise commercially available, and it is undertaken on a patient-by- patient basis for patients who, for example, might be allergic to inactive ingredients in FDA approved drugs or may need a different dosage strength or route of administration. Unlike commercially available drugs, these products are not approved by the FDA but rather are regulated by the state pharmacy board and state law governing the practice of pharmacy. The FDA does not regulate pharmacy-compounded products in recognition of the important public health function performed by traditional compounding. Recently, some pharmacies have been making and marketing stock compound drugs for the WC patient population. Among the FDA "Red Flags" for Enforcement Action on Compounded Drugs is: "Compounding drugs in anticipation of receiving prescriptions, except in very limited quantities in relation to amounts compounded after receiving valid prescriptions." (FDA, 2011) Compound topical analgesics may provide relief by acting locally over the painful site with lower risk of systemic adverse effects on the gastrointestinal system and drug interactions than oral NSAIDs. The issues surrounding compound drugs are due to uncertainties regarding whether the products are medically appropriate and whether payments are reasonable, with the latter issue possibly also involving who dispenses the drug. Medical necessity should be based on the patient's needs combined with the medical and scientific evidence presented in ODG. ODG does not address pricing and fee schedules, but in general there should be consistency within a pharmacy fee schedule for products containing the same active ingredients, so that there is not an inappropriate incentive to use compounding. (Wynn, 2011) See also Co-pack drugs; Medical foods; Physician-dispensed drugs; Repackaged drugs; & Topical analgesics, compounded. Criteria for Compound drugs: (1) Include at least one drug substance (or active ingredient) that is the sole active ingredient in an FDA approved prescription drug, not including OTC drugs. (2) Include only bulk ingredients that are components of FDA approved drugs that have been made in an FDA registered facility and have an NDC code. (3) Is not a drug that was withdrawn or removed from the market for safety reasons. (4) Is not a copy of a commercially available FDA approved drug product. (5) Include only drug substances that have been supported as safe and effective for the prescribed indication by the FDA approval process and/or by adequate medical and scientific evidence in the medical literature. This would allow off-label usage when supported by medical evidence. See specific entries for each ingredient in ODG for the medical and scientific evidence. (6) Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The use of compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. See also topical analgesics, compounded. (Wynn, 2011) As stated above the use of this medication is not indicated. This is secondary to no documentation which states that there has been a failure of first-line FDA approved drug therapy or any explanation as to why this compounded formula is superior in efficacy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Synapryn: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Tramadol is a pain medication in the category of a centrally acting analgesic. They exhibit opioid activity and a mechanism of action that inhibits the reuptake of serotonin and norepinephrine. Centrally acting drugs are reported to be effective in managing neuropathic type pain although it is not recommended as first line therapy. The side effect profile is similar to opioids. For chronic back pain, it appears to be efficacious for short term pain relief, but long term (>16 weeks) results are limited. It also did not appear to improve function. The use of tramadol for osteoarthritis is indicated for short term use only (<3 months) with poor long-term benefit. In this case, the patient does not meet the qualifying criteria. This is secondary to the duration of use, with this medication being indicated on a short-term basis only. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Tabradol: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Due to inadequate documentation of a recent acute exacerbation and poor effectiveness for chronic long- term use, the request is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Cyclobenzaprine: 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): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Due to inadequate documentation of a recent acute exacerbation and poor effectiveness for chronic long-term use, the request is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Ketoprofen cream: 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): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a topical NSAID for pain relief. There are specific criteria require for use based on the guidelines. The MTUS states the following: The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. FDA approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac): Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. In this case, as indicated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of this medication based on the treatment duration. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

1 Urine drug screen: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic)/Urine drug testing (UDT).

Decision rationale: The request is for a urine drug screen. The ODG states the following regarding this topic: Recommended as a tool to monitor compliance with prescribed substances, identify use of undisclosed substances, and uncover diversion of prescribed substances. The test should be used in conjunction with other clinical information when decisions are to be made to continue, adjust or discontinue treatment. This information

includes clinical observation, results of addiction screening, pill counts, and prescription drug monitoring reports. The prescribing clinician should also pay close attention to information provided by family members, other providers and pharmacy personnel. The frequency of urine drug testing may be dictated by state and local laws. Indications for UDT: At the onset of treatment: (1) UDT is recommended at the onset of treatment of a new patient who is already receiving a controlled substance or when chronic opioid management is considered. Urine drug testing is not generally recommended in acute treatment settings (i.e. when opioids are required for nociceptive pain). (2) In cases in which the patient asks for a specific drug. This is particularly the case if this drug has high abuse potential, the patient refuses other drug treatment and/or changes in scheduled drugs, or refuses generic drug substitution. (3) If the patient has a positive or "at risk" addiction screen on evaluation. This may also include evidence of a history of comorbid psychiatric disorder such as depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, and/or personality disorder. See Opioids, screening tests for risk of addiction & misuse. (4) If aberrant behavior or misuse is suspected and/or detected. See Opioids, indicators for addiction & misuse. Ongoing monitoring: (1) If a patient has evidence of a "high risk" of addiction (including evidence of a comorbid psychiatric disorder (such as depression, anxiety, attention-deficit disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, and/or schizophrenia), has a history of aberrant behavior, personal or family history of substance dependence (addiction), or a personal history of sexual or physical trauma, ongoing urine drug testing is indicated as an adjunct to monitoring along with clinical exams and pill counts. See Opioids, tools for risk stratification & monitoring. (2) If dose increases are not decreasing pain and increasing function, consideration of UDT should be made to aid in evaluating medication compliance and adherence. The frequency of drug testing is indicated below: Patients at "low risk" of addiction/aberrant behavior should be tested within six months of initiation of therapy and on a yearly basis thereafter. There is no reason to perform confirmatory testing unless the test is inappropriate or there are unexpected results. If required, confirmatory testing should be for the questioned drugs only. Patients at "moderate risk" for addiction/aberrant behavior are recommended for point-of-contact screening 2 to 3 times a year with confirmatory testing for inappropriate or unexplained results. This includes patients undergoing prescribed opioid changes without success, patients with a stable addiction disorder, those patients in unstable and/or dysfunction social situations, and for those patients with comorbid psychiatric pathology. Patients at "high risk" of adverse outcomes may require testing as often as once per month. This category generally includes individuals with active substance abuse disorders. In this case, a urine drug screen is not supported by the guidelines. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of risk level commensurate to the frequency of evaluation requested. As such, it is not medically necessary.

1 X-ray of cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies, Summary.

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 (Acute and Chronic)/Radiographs.

Decision rationale: The request is for cervical spine radiographs. The ODG state the following regarding qualifying criteria: Indications for imaging X-rays (AP, lateral, etc.): Cervical spine trauma, unconscious: Cervical spine trauma, impaired sensorium (including alcohol and/or drugs): Cervical spine trauma, multiple trauma and/or impaired sensorium: Cervical spine trauma (a serious bodily injury), neck pain, no neurological deficit: Cervical spine trauma, alert, cervical tenderness, paresthesias in hands or feet: Cervical spine trauma, alert, cervical tenderness: Chronic neck pain (after 3 months conservative treatment), patient younger than 40, no history of trauma, first study: Chronic neck pain, patient younger than 40, history of remote trauma, first study: Chronic neck pain, patient older than 40, no history of trauma, first study- Chronic neck pain, patient older than 40, history of remote trauma, first study: Chronic neck pain, patients of any age, history of previous malignancy, first study- Chronic neck pain, patients of any age, history of previous remote neck surgery, first study Post-surgery: evaluate status of fusion. In this case, radiographs are not indicated. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of qualifying criteria as listed above. As such, the request is not certified.

1 TENS unit with supplies: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Transcutaneous electrotherapy.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Lumbar the thoracic/TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).

Decision rationale: Not recommended as an isolated intervention, but a one month home based TENS trial may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option for chronic back pain, if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence based conservative care to achieve functional restoration, including reductions in medication use. Acute: Not recommended based on published literature and a consensus of current guidelines. No proven efficacy has been shown for the treatment of acute low back symptoms. (Herman, 1994) (Bigos, 1999) (van Tulder, 2006) Chronic: Not generally recommended as there is strong evidence that TENS is not more effective than placebo or sham. (Airaksinen, 2006) There is minimal data on how efficacy is affected by type of application, site of application, treatment duration, and optimal frequency/intensity. (Brousseau, 2002) There are sparse randomized controlled trials that have investigated TENS for low back pain. One study of 30 subjects showed a significant decrease in pain intensity over a 60-minute treatment period and for 60 minutes after. (Cheing, 1999) A larger trial of 145 subjects showed no difference between placebo and TENS treatment. (Deyo, 1990) Single-dose studies may not be effective for evaluating long term outcomes, or the standard type of use of this modality in a clinical setting. (Milne-Cochrane, 2001) (Sherry, 2001) (Philadelphia Panel, 2001) (Glaser, 2001) (Maher, 2004) (Brousseau, 2002) (Khadikar, 2005) (Khadikar2, 2005) Although electrotherapeutic modalities are frequently used in the management of CLBP, few studies were found to support their use. Most studies on TENS can be considered of relatively poor methodological quality. TENS does not appear to have an impact on perceived disability or long term pain. High frequency TENS appears to be more effective on pain intensity when compared with low frequency, but this has to be confirmed in future comparative trials. It is also not known if adding TENS to an evidence-based intervention, such as exercise, improves even more outcomes, but studies assessing

the interactions between exercise and TENS found no cumulative impact. (Poitras, 2008) For more information, see the Pain Chapter. Recent research: A recent meta-analysis concluded that the evidence from the small number of placebo-controlled trials does not support the use of TENS in the routine management of chronic LBP. There was conflicting evidence about whether TENS was beneficial in reducing back pain intensity and consistent evidence that it did not improve back-specific functional status. There was moderate evidence that work status and the use of medical services did not change with treatment. Patients treated with acupuncture-like TENS responded similarly to those treated with conventional TENS. (Khadilkar-Cochrane, 2008) On June 8, 2012, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) issued an updated decision memo concluding that TENS is not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of chronic low back pain based on a lack of quality evidence for its effectiveness. Coverage is available only if the beneficiary is enrolled in an approved clinical study. (Jacques, 2012) As stated above the use of TENS therapy in low back pain is not indicated. There is a lack of quality evidence for its effectiveness. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

1 Hot/cold unit: 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), Ankle and Foot, Continuous-flow cryotherapy.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS General Approaches 2004, Section(s): Initial Approaches to Treatment.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of hot or cold treatment to be applied topically to aid in pain relief. The ACOEM guidelines under Physical Methods states that during the acute to subacute phase of injury over the first 2 weeks, application of hot or cold can be effective in ameliorating symptoms. This would aid in facilitation of mobility and exercise. Due to the longstanding duration after injury, continued use would not be indicated in this case. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

3 Shockwave therapy visits for the right wrist: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints 2004, Section(s): Physical Methods.

Decision rationale: The request is for extracorporeal shockwave therapy of the wrists to aid in pain relief. The ACOEM guidelines state the following regarding physical methods for treatment: Physical modalities, such as massage, diathermy, cutaneous laser treatment, "cold" laser treatment, transcutaneous electrical neurostimulation (TENS) units, and biofeedback have no scientifically proven efficacy in treating acute hand, wrist, or forearm symptoms. Limited studies suggest there are satisfying short to medium-term effects due to ultrasound treatment in

patients with mild to moderate idiopathic CTS, but the effect is not curative. Patient's at-home applications of heat or cold packs may be used before or after exercises and are as effective as those performed by a therapist. In this case, the use of this treatment is not indicated. This is secondary to poor supporting high grade clinical evidence of efficacy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

6 Shockwave therapy visits for the cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine: 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) Low Back Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)/ Extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT).

Decision rationale: The request is for extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT). The MTUS guidelines has limited information regarding this topic for back pain. The Official Disability Guidelines state the following: Not recommended. The available evidence does not support the effectiveness of ultrasound or shock wave for treating LBP. In the absence of such evidence, the clinical use of these forms of treatment is not justified and should be discouraged. (Seco, 2011) In this case, the use of this treatment modality is not indicated. This is secondary to poor clinical evidence regarding effectiveness of use. As such, the request is medically necessary.

1 MRI of cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

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 complaints/MRI.

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI. The ACOEM guidelines state that when there is physiological evidence of tissue insult or neurological deficits, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding the next steps including MRI imaging. An imaging study may be appropriate in patients where symptoms have lasted greater than 4-6 weeks and surgery is being considered for a specific anatomic defect or to further evaluate the possibility of serious pathology, such as a tumor. Reliance on imaging studies alone to evaluate the source of neck or upper back symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because it's possible to identify a finding that was present before symptoms began and, therefore, has no temporal association with the symptoms. The ODG guidelines regarding qualifying factors for an MRI of the neck or upper back are as follows: 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. In this case, there is inadequate documentation in a change in neurologic status seen on exam. The records do not indicate new "red flags" which would warrant further imaging evaluation. Pending further information regarding new neurologic deficits, the request is not medically necessary.

1 MRI of thoracic spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

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 complaints/MRI.

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI. The ACOEM guidelines state that when there is physiological evidence of tissue insult or neurological deficits, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding the next steps including MRI imaging. An imaging study may be appropriate in patients where symptoms have lasted greater than 4-6 weeks and surgery is being considered for a specific anatomic defect or to further evaluate the possibility of serious pathology, such as a tumor. Reliance on imaging studies alone to evaluate the source of neck or upper back symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because it's possible to identify a finding that was present before symptoms began and, therefore, has no temporal association with the symptoms. The ODG guidelines regarding qualifying factors for an MRI of the neck or upper back are as follows: 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. In this case, there is inadequate documentation in a change in neurologic status seen on exam. The records do not indicate new "red flags" which would warrant further imaging evaluation. Pending further information regarding new neurologic deficits, the request is not medically necessary.

1 MRI of lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back – Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)/ MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI of the lumbar spine. The ODG guidelines state the following regarding qualifying criteria: 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
- Repeat MRI: When there is significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology (eg, tumor, infection, fracture, neuro compression, recurrent disc herniation)

In this case, the patient would not qualify for an MRI based on the above set standards. This is secondary to a lack of a change in clinical status or described “red flags”. There is a lack of documentation of progressive neurologic deficit. Pending further information revealing qualifying indications as listed above, the request is not medically necessary.

1 MRI of right wrist: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Forearm, Wrist and Hand Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Forearm, Wrist & Hand (Acute & Chronic)/ MRI's (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI of the wrist/hand. The Official Disability Guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Recommended as indicated below. While criteria for which patients may benefit from the addition of MRI have not been established, in selected cases where there is a high clinical suspicion of a fracture despite normal radiographs, MRI may prove useful. (ACR, 2001) (Schmitt, 2003) (Valeri, 1999) (Duer, 2007) Magnetic resonance imaging has been advocated for patients with chronic wrist pain because it enables clinicians to perform a global examination of the osseous and soft tissue structures. It may be diagnostic in patients with triangular fibrocartilage (TFC) and intraosseous ligament tears, occult fractures, avascular neurosis, and miscellaneous other abnormalities. Many articles dispute the value of imaging in the diagnosis of ligamentous tears, because arthroscopy may be

more accurate and treatment can be performed along with the diagnosis. (Dalinka, 2000) (Tehranzadeh, 2006) For inflammatory arthritis, high resolution in-office MRI with an average follow up of 8 months detects changes in bony disease better than radiography, which is insensitive for detecting changes in bone erosions for this patient population in this time frame. (Chen, 2006) See also Radiography.

Indications for imaging - Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI):

- Acute hand or wrist trauma, suspect acute distal radius fracture, radiographs normal, next procedure if immediate confirmation or exclusion of fracture is required
- Acute hand or wrist trauma, suspect acute scaphoid fracture, radiographs normal, next procedure if immediate confirmation or exclusion of fracture is required
- Acute hand or wrist trauma, suspect gamekeeper injury (thumb MCP ulnar collateral ligament injury)
- Chronic wrist pain, plain films normal, suspect soft tissue tumor
- Chronic wrist pain, plain film normal or equivocal, suspect Kienböck's disease
- Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology. (Mays, 2008)

In this case, the request is not indicated. This is secondary to poor documentation of qualifying diagnosis as listed in the guidelines. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

1 MRI of right foot: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Ankle and Foot Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Ankle & Foot (Acute & Chronic)/ MRI.

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI. The official disability guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Recommended as indicated below. MRI provides a more definitive visualization of soft tissue structures, including ligaments, tendons, joint capsule, menisci and joint cartilage structures, than x-ray or Computerized Axial Tomography in the evaluation of traumatic or degenerative injuries. (Colorado, 2001) (ACR-ankle, 2002) (ACR-foot, 2002) The majority of patients with heel pain can be successfully treated conservatively, but in cases requiring surgery (eg, plantar fascia rupture in competitive athletes, deeply infiltrating plantar fibromatosis, masses causing tarsal tunnel syndrome), MR imaging is especially useful in planning surgical treatment by showing the exact location and extent of the lesion. (Narvaez, 2000) MRI is being used with increasing frequency and seems to have become more popular as a screening tool rather than as an adjunct to narrow specific diagnoses or plan operative interventions. This study suggests that many of the pre-referral foot or ankle MRI scans obtained before evaluation by a foot and ankle specialist are not necessary. (Tocci, 2007) Second-look arthroscopy is not necessary to evaluate repaired talar cartilage compared to MRI. (Lee2, 2010) MRI has very high specificity and positive predictive value in diagnosing tears of the anterior talofibular ligament, calcaneofibular ligament and osteochondral lesions. However sensitivity was low with MRI. In a symptomatic patient with ligamentous and chondral pathology in the ankle, negative results on MRI must be viewed with caution and an arthroscopy may still be required for a definitive diagnosis and treatment. (Joshy, 2010) Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) reliably detects acute tears of the anterior talofibular

ligament and calcaneofibular ligament. After acute trauma, MRI is highly sensitive, specific and accurate for determining the level of injury to the ankle syndesmotic ligaments. (Kaminski, 2013) See also ACR Appropriateness Criteria.

Indications for imaging - MRI (magnetic resonance imaging):

- Chronic ankle pain, suspected osteochondral injury, plain films normal
- Chronic ankle pain, suspected tendinopathy, plain films normal
- Chronic ankle pain, pain of uncertain etiology, plain films normal
- Chronic foot pain, pain and tenderness over navicular tuberosity unresponsive to conservative therapy, plain radiographs showed accessory navicular
- Chronic foot pain, athlete with pain and tenderness over tarsal navicular, plain radiographs are Unremarkable
- Chronic foot pain, burning pain and paresthesias along the plantar surface of the foot and toes, suspected of having tarsal tunnel syndrome
- Chronic foot pain, pain in the 3-4 web space with radiation to the toes, Morton's neuroma is clinically suspected
- Chronic foot pain, young athlete presenting with localized pain at the plantar aspect of the heel, plantar fasciitis is suspected clinically

- Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology. (Mays, 2008)

In this case, this study is not indicated. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of a qualifying indication as listed above. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

1 NCV/EMG of the bilateral upper extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

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 ODG state the following regarding this study: Not recommended. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. (Utah, 2006) This systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrate that neurological testing procedures have limited overall diagnostic accuracy in detecting disc herniation with suspected radiculopathy. (Al Nezari, 2013) In the management of spine trauma with radicular symptoms, EMG/nerve conduction studies (NCS) often have low combined sensitivity and specificity in confirming root injury, and there is limited evidence to support the use of often uncomfortable and costly EMG/NCS. (Charles, 2013) See also the Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Chapter for more details on NCS. Studies have not shown portable nerve conduction devices to be effective. EMGs (electromyography) are recommended as an option (needle, not surface) to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, after 1 month conservative therapy, but EMG's are not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious. In this case, the patient does not meet criteria for the study requested. This is secondary to radiculopathy already diagnosed in the records. Pending receipt of information further clarifying how this would change the management rendered, the study is not medically necessary.

1 NCV/EMG of the bilateral lower extremities: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic)/Nerve conduction studies (NCS).

Decision rationale: The request is for nerve conduction studies. The ODG state the following regarding this study: Not recommended. There is minimal justification for performing nerve conduction studies when a patient is presumed to have symptoms on the basis of radiculopathy. (Utah, 2006) This systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrate that neurological testing procedures have limited overall diagnostic accuracy in detecting disc herniation with suspected radiculopathy. (Al Nezari, 2013) In the management of spine trauma with radicular symptoms, EMG/nerve conduction studies (NCS) often have low combined sensitivity and specificity in confirming root injury, and there is limited evidence to support the use of often uncomfortable and costly EMG/NCS. (Charles, 2013) See also the Carpal Tunnel Syndrome Chapter for more details on NCS. Studies have not shown portable nerve conduction devices to be effective. EMGs (electromyography) are recommended as an option (needle, not surface) to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, after 1 month conservative therapy, but EMG's are not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious. In this case, the patient does not meet criteria for the study requested. This is secondary to radiculopathy already diagnosed in the records. Pending receipt of information further clarifying how this would change the management rendered, the study is not medically necessary.