

Case Number:	CM15-0187439		
Date Assigned:	09/29/2015	Date of Injury:	03/17/1995
Decision Date:	11/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/23/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 64 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 3-17-1995. Medical records indicate the worker is undergoing treatment for sacroiliac joint pain, chronic low back pain, myofascial pain syndrome and cervical spondylosis. The only progress report prior to the Utilization Review determination was dated 6-18-2015 and reported the injured worker complained of low back pain and neck pain. Physical examination revealed bilateral lower extremity strength intact. Chiropractic care and Hydrocodone are documented to treat pain well. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medication management. The physician is requesting chiropractic care x 12 visits, Norco 5-325mg daily (unspecified amount) and Lidoderm patches every 12 hours. On 9-2-2015, the Utilization Review modified the request for Chiropractic care x 12 visits to 6 visits and Norco 5-325mg daily to #15 and noncertified the request for Lidoderm patches every 12 hours.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Chiropractic (x12): 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): Manual therapy & manipulation.

Decision rationale: MTUS Guidelines supports chiropractic manipulation for musculoskeletal injury. It is unclear how many sessions have been completed to date. Submitted reports have not demonstrated clear specific functional benefit or change in chronic symptoms and clinical findings for this chronic 1995 injury. There are unchanged clinical findings and functional improvement in terms of decreased pharmacological dosing with pain relief, decreased medical utilization, increased ADLs or improved work/functional status from treatment already rendered by previous chiropractic care. Clinical exam remains unchanged without acute flare-up or new red-flag findings. It appears the patient has received an extensive conservative treatment trial; however, remains unchanged without functional restoration approach. The Chiropractic (x12) is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Norco 5/325mg daily (unspecified quantity): 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, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines cite opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing results or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids in terms of decreased pharmacological dosing, decreased medical utilization, increased ADLs and functional work status with persistent severe pain for this chronic 1995 injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive neurological deterioration. The Norco 5/325mg daily (unspecified quantity) is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Lidoderm patches Q 12 hour: 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): Lidoderm (lidocaine patch).

Decision rationale: The patient exhibits diffuse tenderness and pain on the exam to the cervical and lumbar spine symptoms. The chance of any type of patch improving generalized symptoms and functionality significantly with such diffuse pain is very unlikely. Topical Lidoderm patch is indicated for post-herpetic neuralgia, according to the manufacturer. There is no evidence in any of the medical records that this patient has a neuropathic source for the diffuse pain. Without documentation of clear localized, peripheral pain to support treatment with Lidoderm along with functional benefit from treatment already rendered, medical necessity has not been established. There is no documentation of intolerance to oral medication as the patient is also on multiple other oral analgesics. The Lidoderm patches Q 12 hour is not medically necessary and appropriate.