

Case Number:	CM15-0042644		
Date Assigned:	03/12/2015	Date of Injury:	02/15/2012
Decision Date:	04/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/06/2015

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 44 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 2/15/12. The injured worker has complaints of left side of body and upper back. The active problems have included joint pain, pelvis; sprain shoulder/arm not otherwise specified, left; sprain of back not otherwise specified; abnormality of gait and alteration of sensations rule out neuropathic process. The documentation noted that the injured worker received a left piriformis injection with 50% relief; trigger point injection with 50% relief with some muscles in the left upper back that are tight, she is able to tolerate more activities but still limited due to weakness.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical therapy Qty 12.00: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision

based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back, Physical Therapy, ODG Preface Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: MTUS 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. ODG writes regarding neck and upper back physical therapy, "Recommended. Low stress aerobic activities and stretching exercises can be initiated at home and supported by a physical therapy provider, to avoid debilitation and further restriction of motion." ODG further quantifies its cervical recommendations with: Cervicalgia (neck pain); Cervical spondylosis = 9 visits over 8 weeks, Sprains and strains of neck = 10 visits over 8 weeks. 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." At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. Medical records do not indicate any prior physical therapy. Per guidelines, an initial trial of six sessions is necessary before additional sessions can be approved. The request for 12 sessions is in excess of guidelines. The treating physician does not detail extenuating circumstances that would warrant exception to the guidelines. As such, the request for Physiotherapy twelve sessions is not medically necessary.

Trigger point injection to left upper back and neck Qty 2.00: 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 Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines: Trigger point injections, page(s) 122.

Decision rationale: MTUS states that Trigger Point Injections are "Recommended only for myofascial pain syndrome as indicated below, with limited lasting value. Not recommended for radicular pain." And further states that "trigger point is a discrete focal tenderness located in a palpable taut band of skeletal muscle, which produces a local twitch in response to stimulus to the band. For fibromyalgia syndrome, trigger points injections have not been proven effective." MTUS lists the criteria for Trigger Points: (1) Documentation of circumscribed trigger points with evidence upon palpation of a twitch response as well as referred pain; (2) Symptoms have persisted for more than three months; (3) Medical management therapies such as ongoing stretching exercises, physical therapy, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants have failed to control pain; (4) Radiculopathy is not present (by exam, imaging, or neuro-testing); (5) Not more than 3-4 injections per session; (6) No repeat injections unless a greater than 50% pain relief is obtained for six weeks after an injection and there is documented evidence of functional improvement; (7) Frequency should not be at an interval less than two months; (8) Trigger point injections with

any substance (e.g., saline or glucose) other than local anesthetic with or without steroid are not recommended. There is insufficient documentation to justify further injections. It is unclear what functional improvement there was from previous injections. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Ultracet 37.5/325mg Qty 1.00: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids; ultracet 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: Ultracet is the brand name version of Tramadol and Tylenol. MTUS refers to Tramadol/Tylenol in the context of opioids usage for osteoarthritis "Short-term use: Recommended on a trial basis for short-term use after there has been evidence of failure of first-line non-pharmacologic and medication options (such as acetaminophen or NSAIDs) and when there is evidence of moderate to severe pain. Also recommended for a trial if there is evidence of contraindications for use of first-line medications. Weak opioids should be considered at initiation of treatment with this class of drugs (such as Tramadol, Tramadol/acetaminophen, hydrocodone and codeine), and stronger opioids are only recommended for treatment of severe pain under exceptional circumstances (oxymorphone, oxycodone, hydromorphone, fentanyl, morphine sulfate)." 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 Ultracet 37.5/325mg is not medically necessary.