

Case Number:	CM15-0041513		
Date Assigned:	03/11/2015	Date of Injury:	11/24/2012
Decision Date:	08/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/04/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 48 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/24/2014. On provider visit dated 12/29/2014 the injured worker has reported low back pain, neck pain and left knee pain. On examination of the lumbar spine was noted as decreased range of motion. Positive Patrick Fabere's test bilaterally. Pain at the spinous process of L4-5, L5-S1 on the midline and facets of L3-4, L4-5 and L5-S1 bilaterally with muscle spasm for L2 to L5. Left knee was noted to have a decreased range of motion and pain on the sub patella area close to joint line. McMurray's sign is positive. The diagnoses have included cervical sprain/strain, lumbar strain with disc bulge, bilateral lumbar facet hypertrophy and arthropathy, left knee trauma with internal derangement- status post-surgery with residual pain and left wrist trauma with residual pain. Treatment to date has included medication. The provider requested Bilateral Lumbar diagnostic Facet Block under C arm Fluoroscopy at level L-5-S1 medial branches, Gabapentin, and Ultracet and urine toxicology.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bilateral lumbar diagnostic facet block under C-arm fluoroscopy at level L4-5 and L-5-S1 medial branches: Upheld

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

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, Facet joint diagnostic blocks (injections).

Decision rationale: Per the ODG guidelines, facet joint medial branch blocks are not recommended except as a diagnostic tool, citing minimal evidence for treatment. The ODG indicates that criteria for facet joint diagnostic blocks (injections) are as follows: 1. One set of diagnostic medial branch blocks is required with a response of = 70%. The pain response should last at least 2 hours for Lidocaine. 2. Limited to patients with low-back pain that is non-radicular and at no more than two levels bilaterally. 3. There is documentation of failure of conservative treatment (including home exercise, PT and NSAIDs) prior to the procedure for at least 4-6 weeks. 4. No more than 2 facet joint levels are injected in one session (see above for medial branch block levels). 5. Recommended volume of no more than 0.5 cc of injectate is given to each joint. 6. No pain medication from home should be taken for at least 4 hours prior to the diagnostic block and for 4 to 6 hours afterward. 7. Opioids should not be given as a sedative during the procedure. 8. The use of IV sedation (including other agents such as midazolam) may be grounds to negate the results of a diagnostic block, and should only be given in cases of extreme anxiety. 9. The patient should document pain relief with an instrument such as a VAS scale, emphasizing the importance of recording the maximum pain relief and maximum duration of pain. The patient should also keep medication use and activity logs to support subjective reports of better pain control. 10. Diagnostic facet blocks should not be performed in patients in whom a surgical procedure is anticipated. (Resnick, 2005) 11. Diagnostic facet blocks should not be performed in patients who have had a previous fusion procedure at the planned injection level. [Exclusion Criteria that would require UR physician review: Previous fusion at the targeted level. (Franklin, 2008)] The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker indeed suffers from radiculopathy per clinical findings. Per the most recent progress report dated 12/17/14, the injured worker stated that she had worsening radiation, numbness, and tingling going down her legs. As this procedure is limited to patients with low-back pain that is non- radicular, the request is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 300mg 1 PO bid: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-18.

Decision rationale: With regard to antiepilepsy drugs, the MTUS CPMTG states "Fibromyalgia: Gabapentin and pregabalin have been found to be safe and efficacious to treat pain and other symptoms. (Arnold, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) Pregabalin is FDA approved for fibromyalgia." Per MTUS CPMTG, "Gabapentin (Neurontin) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line

treatment for neuropathic pain." Per MTUS CPMTG p17, "After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects." With regard to medication history, the medical records indicate that the injured worker has used this medication since at least 3/2014. The documentation submitted for review did not contain evidence of improvement in function. The request is not medically necessary.

Ultracet 37.5/325mg 1 every 12 hours for serve pain: 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): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: Pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Ultracet nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. With regard to medication history, the records indicate that the injured worker has been using this medication since 12/2014. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. Per progress report dated 12/29/14, it was noted that UDS from 10/27/14 was reviewed. It stated "It did not show any narcotics at the time since she had run out of the narcotics." As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, the request is not medically necessary.

Urine toxicology: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 87.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain guidelines recommend random drug screening for patients to avoid the misuse of opioids, particularly for those at high risk of abuse. Upon review of the submitted medical records, the injured worker is not a high risk for abuse. Per MTUS CPMTG p87, "Indicators and predictors of possible misuse of controlled substances and/or addiction: 1) Adverse consequences: (a) Decreased functioning, (b) Observed intoxication, (c) Negative effective 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." The injured worker does not demonstrate any indicators, nor is there any documentation of aberrant behavior. The most recent UDS was 10/2014. Furthermore, as opiate therapy is not indicated, the request is not medically necessary.