

Case Number:	CM15-0087873		
Date Assigned:	05/14/2015	Date of Injury:	08/22/2012
Decision Date:	09/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/07/2015

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: California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency 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 54 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 08/22/2012. She has reported subsequent neck, low back and shoulder pain and was diagnosed with cervical and lumbar sprain/strain, cervical and lumbar radiculopathy and herniated nucleus pulposus. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication, application of heat and ice, a home exercise program, physical and chiropractic therapy. In a progress note dated 04/16/2015, the injured worker complained of constant neck, low back and left foot pain. Objective findings were notable for decreased range of motion of the cervical and lumbar spine, tenderness to palpation and spasm of the cervical and lumbar paravertebral muscles, positive Spurling's sign on the right and positive Tinel's sign. A request for authorization of continued chiropractic physiotherapy for the cervical spine 2 x 4, continued acupuncture sessions for the lumbar spine 2 x 4, Tramadol, Gabapentin, Pantoprazole, HMPHCC2 Flurbiprofen/Baclofen/Camphor/Menthol/ Dexamethasone/Micro/Capsaicin/Hyaluronic acid, HNPC1 Amitriptyline/Hydrochloride/ Gabapentin/Bupivacaine/Hydrochloride/Hyaluronic Acid and Tramadol and Pantoprazole on date of service 04/16/2015 was submitted.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Continued chiropractic physiotherapy 2 x 4 for the cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual therapy and manipulation Page(s): 58.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 58-60 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for chiropractic physiotherapy to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines states that manipulation is 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. It is indicated for low back pain but not ankle and foot conditions, carpal tunnel syndrome, forearm/wrist/hand pain, or knee pain. The use of active treatment modalities instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. (Fritz, 2007) Active treatments also allow for fading of treatment frequency along with active self-directed home PT, so that less visits would be required in uncomplicated cases. In this case, the patient would benefit most from at home active therapy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Continued acupuncture sessions 2 x 4 for the lumbar spine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300.

Decision rationale: The request is for acupuncture to aid in pain relief. The ACOEM guidelines state the following regarding this topic. "Acupuncture has not been found effective in the management of back pain, based on several high-quality studies, but there is anecdotal evidence of its success." In this case the guidelines do not support the use of this treatment modality. This is secondary to the diagnosis with poor clinical evidence regarding efficacy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 80-83 of 127.

Decision rationale: Tramadol is a pain medication in the category of a centrally acting analgesic. They exhibit opioid activity and a mechanism of action that inhibits the reuptake of serotonin and norepinephrine. Centrally acting drugs are reported to be effective in managing neuropathic type pain although it is not recommended as first line therapy. The side effect profile is similar to opioids. For chronic back pain, it appears to be efficacious for short term pain relief, but long term (>16 weeks) results are limited. It also did not appear to improve function. The use of tramadol for osteoarthritis is indicated for short term use only (<3 months) with poor long-term benefit. In this case, the patient does not meet the qualifying criteria or indications. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 300mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 16-17 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the category of an anti-epileptic drug (AED). These medications are recommended for certain types of neuropathic pain. Most of the randomized clinical control trials involved include post-herpetic neuralgia and painful polyneuropathy such as in diabetes. There are few trials which have studied central pain or radiculopathy. The MTUS guidelines state that a good response to treatment is 50% reduction in pain. At least a 30% reduction in pain is required for ongoing use, and if this is not seen, this should trigger a change in therapy. There should be documentation of functional improvement and side effects incurred with use. Disease states which prompt use of these medications include post-herpetic neuralgia, spinal cord injury, chronic regional pain syndrome, lumbar spinal stenosis, post-operative pain, and central pain. There is inadequate evidence to support use in non-specific axial low back pain or myofascial pain. In this case, there is inadequate documentation of a condition which would support the use of an anti-epileptic drug. The records also do not reveal functional improvement or screening measures as required. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Pantoprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms and Cardiovascular Risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of a proton pump inhibitor. This is usually given as an acid reducing medication for patients with esophageal reflux, gastritis, or peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain. Unfortunately, they do have certain side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are

classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anti-coagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not medically necessary.

HMPHCC2 Flurbiprofen/Baclofen/Camphor/Menthol/Dexamethasone/Micro/Capsaicin/Hyaluronic Acid: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 11-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the use of the topical muscle relaxant is not indicated for use for the patient's condition. The MTUS states the following: "There is no evidence for use of any other muscle relaxant as a topical product." As such, the request is not medically necessary.

HNPC1 Amitriptyline/Hydrochloride/Gabapentin/Bupivacaine/Hydrochloride/Hyaluronic Acid: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the use of gabapentin is stated to be not indicated for use for the patient's condition. The guidelines state the following: "Gabapentin: Not recommended. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support use." As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Retro Tramadol ER 150mg #30, DOS: 4/16/15: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 80-83 of 127.

Decision rationale: Tramadol is a pain medication in the category of a centrally acting analgesic. They exhibit opioid activity and a mechanism of action that inhibits the reuptake of serotonin and norepinephrine. Centrally acting drugs are reported to be effective in managing neuropathic type pain although it is not recommended as first line therapy. The side effect profile is similar to opioids. For chronic back pain, it appears to be efficacious for short term pain relief, but long term (>16 weeks) results are limited. It also did not appear to improve function. The use of tramadol for osteoarthritis is indicated for short term use only (<3 months) with poor long-term benefit. In this case, the patient does not meet the qualifying criteria or indications. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Retro Pantoprazole 20mg #90, DOS: 4/16/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms and Cardiovascular Risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of a proton pump inhibitor. This is usually given as an acid reducing medication for patients with esophageal reflux, gastritis, or peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain. Unfortunately, they do have certain side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anti-coagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not medically necessary.