

Case Number:	CM15-0045535		
Date Assigned:	03/17/2015	Date of Injury:	01/25/2001
Decision Date:	04/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/10/2015

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: New York
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal 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 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 1/25/2001. The mechanism of injury was not provided for review. The injured worker was diagnosed as having thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis and status post lumbar 3 to sacral 1 decompression and fusion. Treatment to date has included surgery, physical therapy, home exercise and medication management. Currently, progress notes from the treating provider dated 1/14/2015 and 2/4/2015 indicates the injured worker reported increased low back pain that improves with medication.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325/mg, #90, 0 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids for the treatment of chronic pain Page(s): 91-97.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS, Norco is a short-acting opioid analgesic. Opioid drugs are available in various dosage forms and strengths. They are considered the most powerful class of analgesics that may be used to manage both acute and chronic pain. These medications are generally classified according to potency and duration of dosage. The treatment of chronic pain with any opioid analgesic requires review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. A pain assessment should include current pain, intensity of pain after taking the opiate, and the duration of pain relief. In this case, there is no documentation of the medication's pain relief effectiveness, functional status, or response to ongoing opioid analgesic therapy. Medical necessity for the requested item has not been established. Of note, discontinuation of an opioid analgesic should include a taper, to avoid withdrawal symptoms. The requested medication is not medically necessary.

Functional Capacity Evaluation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Fitness for Duty chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Functional capacity evaluation Page(s): 48.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS states that a functional capacity evaluation (FCE) is recommended under certain specific circumstances. The importance of an assessment is to have a measure that can be used repeatedly over the course of treatment to demonstrate improvement of function, or maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate. It should include work functions and or activities of daily living, self-report of disability, objective measures of the patient's functional performance and physical impairments. The guidelines necessitate documentation indicating case management is hampered by complex issues (prior unsuccessful return to work attempts, conflicting medical reports on precautions and/or fitness for modified job), injuries that require detailed exploration of a worker's abilities, and clarification of all additional/secondary conditions in order to recommend an FCE. In this case, there is no documentation that any of the above conditions that are required to complete an FCE, are present. There are no specific indications for an FCE. Medical necessity for the requested service is not established. The requested service is not medically necessary.

Trigger Point Injections x2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 122.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Trigger Point Injections Page(s): 122.

Decision rationale: According to California MTUS Guidelines, trigger point injections with a local anesthetic may be recommended for the treatment of chronic low back or neck pain with myofascial pain syndrome when all of the following criteria are met: 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 on exam; 5) Not more than 3-4 injections per session; 6) No repeat injections unless greater than 50% pain relief is obtained for six weeks after an injection and there is documented evidence of functional improvement; 7) Frequency should be at an interval less than 2 months; 8) Trigger point injections with any substance other than local anesthetic with or without steroid are not recommended. There was no documentation provided indicating circumscribed trigger points with palpable twitch response and referred pain. Medical necessity for the requested item has not been established. The requested trigger point injection is not medically necessary.