

Case Number:	CM15-0113810		
Date Assigned:	06/22/2015	Date of Injury:	06/20/2010
Decision Date:	07/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/12/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 65 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on February 8, 2008. She has reported low back pain with radiating down into the left leg and has been diagnosed with lack of posterior spinal fusion, status post posterior pedicle screw fixation L4-S1. Treatment has included medications, medical imaging, and surgery. On examination range of motion was significantly restricted to about 10 degrees. Her sensation was diminished to a left L5 and S1 light touch dermatomal distribution. The treatment request included a lumbar brace and oxycodone.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Oxycodone 10mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines cite opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Oxycodone 10mg #120 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Purchase of lumbar brace: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Low Back Chapter 12, page 301.

Decision rationale: There is no indication of instability, compression fracture, or spondylolisthesis precautions to warrant a custom back brace for acute post-operative use. Reports have not adequately demonstrated the medical indication for the custom back brace. Based on the information provided and the peer-reviewed, nationally recognized guidelines, the request for an LSO cannot be medically recommended. CA MTUS states that lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief. This claimant is well beyond the acute phase of injury. In addition, ODG states Lumbar supports as not recommended for prevention and is under study for treatment of nonspecific LBP, recommending as an option for compression fractures and specific treatment of spondylolisthesis, documented instability, and post-operative treatment. The Purchase of lumbar brace is not medically necessary and appropriate.