

Case Number:	CM15-0047677		
Date Assigned:	04/28/2015	Date of Injury:	12/23/2014
Decision Date:	05/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/13/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 12/23/2014. Her diagnoses, and/or impressions, included lumbosacral radiculitis; lumbosacral radiculopathy; discogenic syndrome; lumbosacral/joint/ligament sprain/strain; and thoracic sprain/strain. Current history notes a left rib-cage strain and left abdominal strain that is slowly improving, along with improvement of the pain in her back; she is back to work on full duties. No current magnetic resonance imaging studies are noted; however, an order for magnetic resonance imaging studies of the lumbar spine were noted ordered on 2/24/2015. Her treatments have included electrical stimulation, lumbar; home exercises; and medication management. Progress notes of 2/24/2015 are hand-written and mostly illegible. Reported was continued low back pain that radiated into the bilateral lower extremities that is worsened with activity and interferes with her sleep. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include Lido Pro topical cream; chiropractic treatments; and magnetic resonance imaging studies of the lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the 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): 303-304.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on low back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: 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. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computed tomography [CT] for bony structures). Relying solely on imaging studies to evaluate the source of low back and related symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a finding that was present before symptoms began and therefore has no temporal association with the symptoms. Techniques vary in their abilities to define abnormalities (Table 12-7). Imaging studies should be reserved for cases in which surgery is considered or red-flag diagnoses are being evaluated. Because the overall false-positive rate is 30% for imaging studies in patients over age 30 who do not have symptoms, the risk of diagnostic confusion is great. There is no recorded presence of emerging red flags on the physical exam. There is evidence of nerve compromise on physical exam but there is not mention of consideration for surgery or complete failure of conservative therapy. For these reasons, criteria for imaging as defined above per the ACOEM have not been met. Therefore, the request is not certified.

Chiropractic Therapy x 12 sessions for the Thoracic and Lumbar Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back, Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Manipulation, Chiropractic Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines manual manipulation Page(s): 58-59.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical guidelines section on manual manipulation states: Recommended for chronic pain if caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Manual Therapy is widely used in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. The intended goal or effect of Manual Medicine is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. Manipulation is manual therapy that moves a joint beyond the physiologic range-of-motion but not beyond the anatomic range-of-motion. Low back: Recommended as an option. Therapeutic care, Trial of 6 visits over 2 weeks, with

evidence of objective functional improvement, up to 18 visits over 6-8 weeks. Elective/maintenance care; Not medically necessary. Recurrences/flare-ups; Need to reevaluate treatment success, if RTW achieved then 1-2 visits every 4-6 months. Ankle & Foot: Not recommended. Carpal tunnel syndrome: Not recommended. Forearm, Wrist, & Hand: Not recommended. Knee: Not recommended. Treatment Parameters from state guidelines; a. Time to produce effect: 4 to 6 treatments Manual manipulation is recommended form of treatment for chronic pain. However the requested amount of therapy sessions is in excess of the recommendations per the California MTUS. The California MTUS states there should be not more than 6 visits over 2 weeks and documented evidence of functional improvement before continuation of therapy. The request is for 12 sessions. This does not meet criteria guidelines and thus is not certified.

Lidopro 4oz: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain, Topical Analgesics, Salicylate Topicals and <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24547599>, The pharmacology of topical analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical analgesics states: Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenic amines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The requested medication contains ingredients, which are not indicated per the California MTUS for topical analgesic use. Therefore, the request is not certified.