

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0212292		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/04/2015
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/11/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/27/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/28/2015

### 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: North Carolina

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:

This is a 43 year old male with a date of injury on 3-4-15. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for neck and back pain. Progress report dated 10-2-15 reports continued intermittent moderate lower back pain rated 6 out of 10. The increase with activity prolonged walking and sitting. The injured worker states physical therapy has helped relieve the pain and he would like to continue physical therapy. Objective findings: cervical spine has increased tone with tenderness, no trigger points, some guarding and cervical distraction test is positive; the thoracic spine is tender to palpation with spasm over the parascapular musculature bilaterally. The lumbar spine has increased tone, tenderness, and muscle spasm. Treatments include medication, physical therapy, trigger point injections, acupuncture, psychotherapy, cognitive behavior therapy. Request for authorization was made for Physical Therapy 2 x Wk x 6 Wks, Pain Psychology Consult & Testing x 7 with Doctor, Zanaflex 2 mg 1 by mouth Tab every night at bedtime quantity 30. Utilization review dated 10-27-15 modified the request to certify Zanaflex 2 mg quantity 15 and non-certified Physical Therapy and Pain Psychology Consult & Testing.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Physical Therapy 2xWk x 6Wks: 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): Physical Medicine.

**Decision rationale:** Physical Medicine Guidelines: Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks. Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2): 8-10 visits over 4 weeks. Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. The requested amount of physical therapy is in excess of California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines. There is no objective explanation why the patient would need excess physical therapy and not be transitioned to active self-directed physical medicine. The request is not medically necessary.

**Pain Psychology Consult & Testing x7 with Doctor:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Practice Guidelines, Chapter 7: Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Psychological treatment.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on psychological treatment states: Recommended for appropriately identified patients during treatment for chronic pain. Psychological intervention for chronic pain includes setting goals, determining appropriateness of treatment, conceptualizing a patient's pain beliefs and coping styles, assessing psychological and cognitive function, and addressing co-morbid mood disorders (such as depression, anxiety, panic disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder). Cognitive behavioral therapy and self-regulatory treatments have been found to be particularly effective. Psychological treatment incorporated into pain treatment has been found to have a positive short-term effect on pain interference and long-term effect on return to work. The following 'stepped-care' approach to pain management that involves psychological intervention has been suggested: Step 1: Identify and address specific concerns about pain and enhance interventions that emphasize self-management. The role of the psychologist at this point includes education and training of pain care providers in how to screen for patients that may need early psychological intervention. Step 2: Identify patients who continue to experience pain and disability after the usual time of recovery. At this point a consultation with a psychologist allows for screening, assessment of goals, and further treatment options, including brief individual or group therapy. Step 3: Pain is sustained in spite of continued therapy (including the above psychological care). Intensive care may be required from mental health professions allowing for a multidisciplinary treatment approach. See also Multi-disciplinary pain programs. See also ODG Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) Guidelines. (Otis, 2006) (Townsend, 2006) (Kerns, 2005) (Flor, 1992) (Morley, 1999) (Ostelo, 2005) Psychological treatment in particular cognitive behavioral therapy has been found to be particularly effective in the treatment of

chronic pain. As this patient has continued ongoing pain, this service is indicated per the California MTUS and thus is medically necessary.

**Zanaflex 2mg 1 by mouth Tab every night at bedtime #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004.

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

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (Van Tulder, 2003) (Van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain, but rather for ongoing and chronic back pain and neck pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.