

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0045005		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/29/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	02/25/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/09/2015

### 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: Texas, Florida, California  
 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 30 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 10/29/14. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back. The injured worker was diagnosed as having acute lumbosacral strain and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatments to date have included oral pain medication, steroids, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, and activity modification. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain in the back. The plan of care was for medication prescriptions, acupuncture, diagnostics and a follow up appointment at a later date.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Ranitidine 300mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation National Library of Medicine.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 68 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS speaks to the use of Proton Pump Inhibitors like in this case in the context of Non Steroid Anti-inflammatory Prescription. It notes that clinicians should weigh the indications for NSAIDs against gastrointestinal risk factors such as: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Sufficient gastrointestinal risks are not noted in these records. The request, being not medically necessary, is appropriately non-certified based on MTUS guideline review.

**Tramadol 50mg #60:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain interventions and treatments 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 12, 13 83 and 113.

**Decision rationale:** This injury is now six months ago. Per the MTUS, Tramadol is still being requested. It is an opiate analogue medication, not recommended as a first-line therapy. The MTUS based on Cochrane studies found very small pain improvements, and adverse events caused participants to discontinue the medicine. Most important, there are no long term studies to allow it to be recommended for use past six months. A long term use of is therefore not supported. The request is not medically necessary.

**Naproxen 550mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines: Pain interventions and treatments 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 67 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** It is noted the injury was in 2014, and the past treatment also has included NSAIDs. Long term NSAID use is not advised. The MTUS recommends NSAID medication for osteoarthritis and pain at the lowest dose, and the shortest period possible. The guides cite that there is no reason to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. Further, the MTUS cites there is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. This claimant though has been on some form of a prescription non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medicine for some time, with no documented objective benefit or functional improvement. The MTUS guideline of the shortest possible period of use is clearly not met. Without evidence of objective, functional benefit, such as improved work ability, improved activities of daily living, or other medicine reduction, the MTUS does not support the use of this medicine. It is not medically necessary & appropriately non-certified.

**Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #60:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines MTUS 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 41-42 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS recommends Flexeril (cyclobenzaprine) for a short course of therapy. The effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. Treatment should be brief. The addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended. In this case, there has been no objective functional improvement noted in the long-term use of Flexeril in this claimant. Long term use is not supported. Also, it is being used with other agents, which also is not clinically supported in the MTUS. This request is not medically necessary.

**8 sessions of acupuncture over 4 weeks for the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS notes frequency and duration of acupuncture or acupuncture may be up to 6 treatments to confirm functional improvement. Acupuncture treatments may be extended only if true functional improvement is documented as defined in Section 9792.20(f). This frequency and duration requested at 8 sessions is above guides as to what may be effective, and there is no objective documentation of effective functional improvement in the claimant from past care. The sessions were not medically necessary and appropriately non-certified under the MTUS Acupuncture criteria.

**MRI without contrast lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303, Low Back Complaints.

**Decision rationale:** In this case, pain only complaints of a subjective nature are described. Under MTUS/ACOEM, although there is subjective information presented in regarding increasing pain, there are little accompanying physical signs. Even if the signs are of an equivocal nature, the MTUS note that electrodiagnostic confirmation generally comes first. They note "Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be

obtained before ordering an imaging study." The guides warn that indiscriminate imaging will result in false positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. I did not find electrodiagnostic studies. It can be said that ACOEM is intended for more acute injuries; therefore other evidence-based guides were also examined. The ODG guidelines note, in the Low Back Procedures section: Lumbar spine trauma: trauma, neurological deficit; Lumbar spine trauma: seat belt (chance) fracture (If focal, radicular findings or other neurologic deficit); Uncomplicated low back pain, suspicion of cancer, infection; Uncomplicated low back pain, with radiculopathy, after at least 1 month conservative therapy, sooner if severe or progressive neurologic deficit. (For unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, see AMA Guides, 5th Edition, page 382-383.) (Andersson, 2000); Uncomplicated low back pain, prior lumbar surgery; Uncomplicated low back pain, cauda equina syndrome. These criteria are also not met in this case; the request was not medically necessary & appropriately non-certified under the MTUS and other evidence-based criteria.