

Case Number:	CM15-0024784		
Date Assigned:	02/17/2015	Date of Injury:	02/11/2003
Decision Date:	03/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/09/2015

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: Family Practice

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 35 year old female injured worker suffered and industrial injury on 2/11/2003. The diagnoses were lumbosacral spondylosis without myelopathy, lumbar facet arthropathy, lumbar degenerative disc disease and lumbar radiculopathy. The treatments were medications and home exercise program. The treating provider reported the low back pain to be from 5/10 to 10/10 that is sharp, dull and throbbing. On exam the lumbar spine had diffuse tenderness with spasms. The Utilization Review Determination on 1/30/2015 non-certified: 1. Selective Nerve Root Blocks at L4-L5 with anesthesia/x-ray, and fluoroscopic guidance, citing MTUS. 2. Norco 10/325mg #150, citing MTUS. 3. Urine toxicology screen, citing MTUS.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Outpatient Selective Nerve Root Blocks at L4-L5 with anesthesia/x-ray, and fluoroscopic guidance: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Steroid Injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the use of epidural steroid injections as a treatment modality. These guidelines state the following: Recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain (defined as pain in dermatomal distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy). Most current guidelines recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. This is in contradiction to previous generally cited recommendations for a series of three ESIs. These early recommendations were primarily based on anecdotal evidence. Research has now shown that, on average, less than two injections are required for a successful ESI outcome. Current recommendations suggest a second epidural injection if partial success is produced with the first injection, and a third ESI is rarely recommended. Epidural steroid injection can offer short term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. There is little information on improved function. The American Academy of Neurology recently concluded that epidural steroid injections may lead to an improvement in radicular lumbosacral pain between 2 and 6 weeks following the injection, but they do not affect impairment of function or the need for surgery and do not provide long-term pain relief beyond 3 months, and there is insufficient evidence to make any recommendation for the use of epidural steroid injections to treat radicular cervical pain. Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. 8) Current research does not support a series-of-three injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. In this case, there is insufficient evidence that the patient meets the primary criteria for the use of a selective nerve root block; specifically, that the symptoms are caused by a radiculopathy. There is insufficient evidence from the patient's symptoms and physical examination findings that support the diagnosis of lumbar radiculopathy in the L4-5 distribution. For this reason, the use of an outpatient selective nerve root block at L4-5 with anesthesia/X-ray/fluoroscopic guidance is not considered as medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #150: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 76-78, 80.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the long-term use of opioids, including Norco. These guidelines have established criteria on the use of opioids for the ongoing management of pain. Actions should include: prescriptions from a single practitioner and from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. There should be an ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain, the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. There should be evidence of documentation of the 4 As for Ongoing Monitoring. These four domains include: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychological functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. Further, there should be consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain that does not improve on opioids in 3 months. There should be consideration of an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse (Pages 76-78). Finally, the guidelines indicate that for chronic back pain, the long-term efficacy of opioids is unclear. Failure to respond to a time-limited course of opioids has led to the suggestion of reassessment and consideration of alternative therapy (Page 80). Based on the review of the medical records, there is insufficient documentation in support of these stated MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines for the ongoing use of opioids. There is insufficient documentation of the 4 As for Ongoing Monitoring. The treatment course of opioids in this patient has extended well beyond the timeframe required for a reassessment of therapy. In summary, there is insufficient documentation to support the chronic use of an opioid in this patient. Treatment with Norco is not considered as medically necessary.

Urine toxicology screen: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 43.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Indicators and Predictors of Possible Misuse of Controlled Substances and/or Addiction.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines describe the indicators and predictors of possible misuse of controlled substances and/or addiction and its relationship to urine toxicology screening. These indicators and predictors are as follows: 1) Adverse consequences: (a) Decreased functioning, (b) Observed intoxication, (c) Negative affective state. 2) Impaired control over medication use: (a) Failure to bring in unused medications, (b) Dose escalation without approval of the prescribing doctor, (c) Requests for early prescription refills, (d) Reports of lost or stolen prescriptions, (e) Unscheduled clinic appointments in distress, (f) Frequent visits to the ED, (g) Family reports of overuse of

intoxication. 3) Craving and preoccupation: (a) Non-compliance with other treatment modalities, (b) Failure to keep appointments, (c) No interest in rehabilitation, only in symptom control, (d) No relief of pain or improved function with opioid therapy, (e) Overwhelming focus on opiate issues. 4) Adverse behavior: (a) Selling prescription drugs, (b) Forging prescriptions, (c) Stealing drugs, (d) Using prescription drugs in ways other than prescribed (such as injecting oral formulations), (e) Concurrent use of alcohol or other illicit drugs (as detected on urine screens), (f) Obtaining prescription drugs from non-medical sources. Regarding the use of urine toxicology screening, the guidelines state that drug testing is recommended as an option, using a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs; specifically, when there is sufficient cause as with a patient who demonstrates behavior consistent with any of the above indicators/predictors. In this case, there is insufficient documentation that the patient has demonstrated any of the behaviors listed above that suggests addiction/diversion. For this reason, a urine toxicology screen is not considered as medically necessary.