

Case Number:	CM15-0041788		
Date Assigned:	03/12/2015	Date of Injury:	06/30/2009
Decision Date:	04/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/05/2015

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 46-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 30, 2009. He reported an injury to his back when shoveling. The injured worker was diagnosed as having acute severe lumbosacral strain with herniated nucleated pulposus and lumbosacral sprain/strain with associated hip myofascitis. Treatment to date has included chiropractic therapy, medications, surgery to the lumbar-sacral spine, lumbar facet blocks which provided 70% relief and durable medication equipment. He had left knee surgery on November 15, 2014. The documentation reveals that post-surgical physical therapy, medications and two spinal injections have failed to improve the back pain. Currently, the injured worker complains of decreased pain and stiffness of the left knee. He reports a low of strength and range of motion in the lower extremities. His treatment plan included physical therapy, hydrocodone, tramadol and diclofenac.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy for the left knee 2x6: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines
Page(s): 99.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg (Acute & Chronic), Physical Therapy, ODG Preface - Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines refer to physical medicine guidelines for physical therapy and recommends as follows: "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." Additionally, ACOEM guidelines advise against passive modalities by a therapist unless exercises are to be carried out at home by patient. Regarding physical therapy, ODG states "Patients should be formally assessed after a "six-visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted."The employee has had physical therapy in the past including after surgery, but there is no documentation of the functional benefits and the plan for the new sessions. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Hydrocodone 10/325mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 80.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute and Chronic), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Shoulder, Pain, Opioids.

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck and low back pain 'except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that "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."The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Additionally, medical documents indicate that the patient has been on an opioid in excess of the recommended 2-week limit. The treating physician does not detail sufficient information to substantiate the need for continued opioid medication. As such, the question for hydrocodone is not medically necessary.

Tramadol 50mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 80.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids; Tramadol Page(s): 74-123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®).

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/acetaminophen." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. As such, the request for tramadol is not medically necessary.

Diclofenac 75mg #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 22, 67.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 63-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Diclofenac.

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) Back Pain - Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. 4) Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long-term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. The treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Importantly, ODG also states that diclofenac is "Not recommended as first line due to increased risk profile. If using diclofenac then consider discontinuing as it should only be used for the shortest duration possible in the lowest effective dose due to reported serious adverse events." The quantity requested in excess of the shortest duration possible. As such, the request for is not medically necessary.

