

Case Number:	CM14-0212712		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2014	Date of Injury:	10/08/2013
Decision Date:	03/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/12/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/18/2014

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 Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 patient is a 52-year-old man who sustained a work-related injury on October 8, 2013. Subsequently, he developed with chronic neck pain. According to the progress report dated November 20, 2014, the patient continued to suffer from headaches, neck pain, and depression. Examination of the cervical spine revealed decreased range of motion in neck, especially with extension. Positive muscle spasms and tenderness over the facet joints. Tenderness over the cervical trapezial ridge. MRI of the cervical spine dated October 16, 2014 showed early disc desiccation at C2-3 to C6-7 levels. Mucosal thickening seen in left maxillary sinus. C3-4: focal central disc protrusion effacing the thecal sac. C4-5: focal central disc protrusion effacing the thecal sac. Neuroforaminal narrowing on right side without significant impingement upon exiting nerve root. C6-7: focal central disc protrusion effacing the thecal sac. The patient was diagnosed with cervical discogenic disease and status post concussive headaches. The provider requested authorization for Norco and Cervical facet block C2-3 and C3-4 bilaterally.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for Use of Opioids Page(s): 78, 80-81 & 124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules:(a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy.(b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function.(c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325mg #120 is not medically necessary.

Cervical facet block C2-3 bilaterally: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Neck Chapter, Cervical Diagnostic Blocks

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) < Facet joint intra-articular injections (therapeutic blocks) (http://worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/low_back.htm#Facetjointinjections).)>.

Decision rationale: Joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain>. According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, < Under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based

conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003) (Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti, 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial. >Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, < Criteria for use of therapeutic intra-articular and medial branch blocks, are as follows: 1. No more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is recommended. 2. There should be no evidence of radicular pain, spinal stenosis, or previous fusion. 3. If successful (initial pain relief of 70%, plus pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). 4. No more than 2 joint levels may be blocked at any one time. 5. There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection. The ODG guidelines did not support facet injection for cervical pain in this context. There is no strong evidence supporting the use of cervical facet injection for the treatment of neck pain. There is no documentation that the cervical facets are the main pain generator. There is no documentation of formal rehabilitation plan that will be used in addition to facet injections. Furthermore, there is no documentation of rationale behind the request for cervical facet block and whether this is used for diagnostic and therapeutic purpose. Therefore, Cervical facet block C2-3 bilaterally is not medically necessary.

Cervical facet block C3-4 bilaterally: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Neck Chapter, Cervical Diagnostic Blocks

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) < Facet joint intra-articular injections (therapeutic blocks) (http://worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/low_back.htm#Facetjointinjections).)>.

Decision rationale: Joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain. >According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, < Under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003)

(Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti , 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial.>Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, < Criteria for use of therapeutic intra-articular and medial branch blocks, are as follows:1. No more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is recommended. 2. There should be no evidence of radicular pain, spinal stenosis, or previous fusion.3. If successful (initial pain relief of 70%, plus pain relief of at least 50% for a duration of at least 6 weeks), the recommendation is to proceed to a medial branch diagnostic block and subsequent neurotomy (if the medial branch block is positive). 4. No more than 2 joint levels may be blocked at any one time.5. There should be evidence of a formal plan of additional evidence-based activity and exercise in addition to facet joint injection The ODG guidelines did not support facet injection for cervical pain in this context. There is no strong evidence supporting the use of cervical facet injection for the treatment of neck pain. There is no documentation that the cervical facets are the main pain generator. There is no documentation of formal rehabilitation plan that will be used in addition to facet injections. Furthermore, there is no documentation of rationale behind the request for cervical facet block and whether this is used for diagnostic and therapeutic purpose. Therefore, Cervical facet block C3-4 bilaterally is not medically necessary.