

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0219810		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/12/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/20/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	12/22/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/09/2015

### 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: 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:

The injured worker is a 32 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 1-20-2014. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for posttraumatic stress disorder, major depressive disorder, pain disorder associated with psychological factors, lumbago, left shoulder impingement, left shoulder and neck pain, and postconcussion syndrome. On 10-20-2015, the injured worker reported stable mood and decreased anxiety on current medications, with overall improvement in his ability to cope although still had some reaction to loud noises, sirens, and banging sounds. The Psychiatric progress report dated 10-20-2015, noted the injured worker had recently been started on Prazosin at night and as yet had not noted any significant side effects, no change in baseline dizziness, and no improvement with decrease in nightmares. The injured worker's current medications were noted to include Sertraline, Mirtazapine, Prazosin, Butalbital-Caffeine-Acetaminophen, and Omeprazole. The psychological testing was noted to show the injured worker's testing scores with continued improvement. The injured worker was noted to have fleeting thoughts of killing himself with no plans of intent, remained critical of himself, some mild anhedonia, and admission of some hopelessness. Prior treatments have included cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and physical therapy. The treatment plan was noted to include continued medication, continued daily walking, continued cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), and the injured worker was urged to investigate vocational rehabilitation options as the provider noted he was ready to begin some retraining. The injured worker's work status was noted to remain off work. The request for authorization was noted to have requested a MDE/IDE evaluation for a functional restoration program. The Utilization Review (UR) dated 10-26-2015, non-certified the request for a MDE/IDE evaluation for a functional restoration program.

## IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MDE/IDE evaluation for a functional restoration program:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Functional restoration programs (FRPs).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Functional restoration programs (FRPs).

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on functional restoration programs states: Recommended, although research is still ongoing as to how to most appropriately screen for inclusion in these programs. Functional restoration programs (FRPs), a type of treatment included in the category of interdisciplinary pain programs (see chronic pain programs), were originally developed by [REDACTED] FRPs were designed to use a medically directed, interdisciplinary pain management approach geared specifically to patients with chronic disabling occupational musculoskeletal disorders. These programs emphasize the importance of function over the elimination of pain. FRPs incorporate components of exercise progression with disability management and psychosocial intervention. Long-term evidence suggests that the benefit of these programs diminishes over time, but still remains positive when compared to cohorts that did not receive an intensive program. (Bendix, 1998) A Cochrane review suggests that there is strong evidence that intensive multidisciplinary rehabilitation with functional restoration reduces pain and improves function of patients with low back pain. The evidence is contradictory when evaluating the programs in terms of vocational outcomes. (Guzman 2001) It must be noted that all studies used for the Cochrane review excluded individuals with extensive radiculopathy, and several of the studies excluded patients who were receiving a pension, limiting the generalizability of the above results. Studies published after the Cochrane review also indicate that intensive programs show greater effectiveness, in particular in terms of return to work, than less intensive treatment. (Airaksinen, 2006) There appears to be little scientific evidence for the effectiveness of multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation compared with other rehabilitation facilities for neck and shoulder pain, as opposed to low back pain and generalized pain syndromes. (Karjalainen, 2003) Treatment is not suggested for longer than 2 weeks without evidence of demonstrated efficacy as documented by subjective and objective gains. For general information see chronic pain programs. While functional restoration programs are recommended per the California MTUS, the length of time is for 2 weeks unless there is documentation of demonstrated efficacy by subjective and objective gains. The request is for evaluation without a specified amount of time. This is in excess of the recommendations and thus is not medically necessary.