

Case Number:	CM13-0059593		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2013	Date of Injury:	09/24/2007
Decision Date:	03/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/15/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/02/2013

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 9/24/07. A utilization review determination dated 11/15/13 recommends non-certification of MRI of the lumbar spine and home health care. APAP/codeine was modified from #120 to #60. PR-2 progress report dated 10/17/2013 documented the patient returns today stating she is symptomatic. Objective findings on exam reveal the lumbar spine has pain, tenderness and limited range of motion. Positive straight leg raise is noted.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

APAP/Codeine 300/30mg, #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 76-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for APAP/Codeine, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that, due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. Unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested APAP/Codeine is not medically necessary.

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 based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for MRI of the lumbar spine, CA MTUS and ACOEM state that 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 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. ODG states that MRIs are recommended for uncomplicated low back pain with radiculopathy after at least one month of conservative therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic exam. Additionally, there is no statement indicating what medical decision-making will be based upon the outcome of the currently requested MRI. Furthermore, there is no documentation indicating how the patient's subjective complaints and objective findings have changed since the time of the most recent MRI of the lumbar spine. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

Home health one day a week for four hours a day: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Home health services Page(s): 51.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Home health one day a week for four hours day, California MTUS states that home health services are recommended only for otherwise recommended medical treatment for patients who are homebound, and medical treatment does

not include homemaker services like shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom when this is the only care needed. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation that the patient is homebound and in need of specialized home care (such as skilled nursing care, physical, occupational, or speech-language therapy) in addition to home health care. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Home health one day a week for four hours day is not medically necessary.