

Case Number:	CM15-0116025		
Date Assigned:	06/24/2015	Date of Injury:	08/20/2013
Decision Date:	07/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/16/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, 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 injured worker is a 45 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/20/2013, while employed as a laborer, after he tripped on rebar. Additional injury was noted in 10/2012. The injured worker was diagnosed as having meniscus derangement, muscle atrophy of left quad, and chronic pain syndrome. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, arthroscopic repair of a partial tear of the medial meniscus, left knee on 1/09/2013, physical therapy, Functional Restoration Program, and medications. Currently (week 7 of Functional Restoration Program, 6/1/15-6/5/15), the injured worker complains of increased lower back pain this week. He reported working hard all week and then driving home for 90 minutes, possibly causing flare-up. He continued to complain of left knee pain and was not wearing the brace because it was too tight on his calf. Objective findings noted a 5 pound weight loss since the initial evaluation, increased lumbar lordosis, tenderness in the lower lumbosacral region, moderate spasm in the bilateral thoracolumbar region, and an antalgic gait with the use of a cane. Slight swelling of the left knee was noted, along with tenderness to palpation of the left medial knee and tibial plateau. Improvement in muscle tone of the left quad was noted and left lower extremity deep tendon reflexes were 1+. Crusted lesions were present in the left lateral thoracic region in T5-6 dermatomal pattern, consistent with Zoster. The treatment plan included continued Functional Restoration Program for 8 weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Functional restoration program 10 additional days, 31-40 days/151-200 hours: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Functional restoration programs, Criteria for the general use of multidisciplinary pain management programs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs) Page(s): 31-33.

Decision rationale: Chronic pain programs (functional restoration programs) Recommended where there is access to programs with proven successful outcomes, for patients with conditions that put them at risk of delayed recovery. Patients should also be motivated to improve and return to work, and meet the patient selection criteria outlined below. Also called Multidisciplinary pain programs or Interdisciplinary rehabilitation programs, these pain rehabilitation programs combine multiple treatments, and at the least, include psychological care along with physical therapy & occupational therapy (including an active exercise component as opposed to passive modalities). While recommended, the research remains ongoing as to: (1) what is considered the "gold-standard" content for treatment; (2) the group of patients that benefit most from this treatment; (3) the ideal timing of when to initiate treatment; (4) the intensity necessary for effective treatment; and (5) cost-effectiveness. It has been suggested that interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary care models for treatment of chronic pain may be the most effective way to treat this condition. (Flor, 1992) (Gallagher, 1999) (Guzman, 2001) (Gross, 2005) (Sullivan, 2005) (Dysvik, 2005) (Airaksinen, 2006) (Schonstein, 2003) (Sanders, 2005) (Patrick, 2004) (Buchner, 2006) Unfortunately, being a claimant may be a predictor of poor long-term outcomes. (Robinson, 2004) These treatment modalities are based on the biopsychosocial model, one that views pain and disability in terms of the interaction between physiological, psychological and social factors. (Gatchel, 2005) There appears to be little scientific evidence for the effectiveness of multidisciplinary biopsychosocial rehabilitation compared with other rehabilitation facilities for neck and shoulder pain, as opposed to low back pain and generalized pain syndromes. (Karjalainen, 2003) Types of programs: There is no one universal definition of what comprises interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary treatment. The most commonly referenced programs have been defined in the following general ways (Stanos, 2006): (1) Multidisciplinary programs: Involves one or two specialists directing the services of a number of team members, with these specialists often having independent goals. These programs can be further subdivided into four levels of pain programs: (a) Multidisciplinary pain centers (generally associated with academic centers and include research as part of their focus); (b) Multidisciplinary pain clinics; (c) Pain clinics; (d) Modality-oriented clinics; (2) Interdisciplinary pain programs: Involves a team approach that is outcome focused and coordinated and offers goal-oriented interdisciplinary services. Communication on a minimum of a weekly basis is emphasized. The most intensive of these programs is referred to as a Functional Restoration Program, with a major emphasis on maximizing function versus minimizing pain. See Functional restoration programs. Predictors of success and failure: As noted, one of the criticisms of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary rehabilitation programs is the lack of an appropriate screening tool to help to determine who will most benefit from this treatment. Retrospective research has examined decreased rates of completion of functional restoration programs, and there is ongoing research to evaluate screening tools prior to entry.

(Gatchel, 2006) The following variables have been found to be negative predictors of efficacy of treatment with the programs as well as negative predictors of completion of the programs: (1) a negative relationship with the employer/supervisor; (2) poor work adjustment and satisfaction; (3) a negative outlook about future employment; (4) high levels of psychosocial distress (higher pretreatment levels of depression, pain and disability); (5) involvement in financial disability disputes; (6) greater rates of smoking; (7) duration of pre-referral disability time; (8) prevalence of opioid use; and (9) pre treatment levels of pain. (Linton, 2001) (Bendix, 1998)

(Multidisciplinary treatment strategies are effective for patients with chronic low back pain (CLBP) in all stages of chronicity and should not only be given to those with lower grades of CLBP, according to the results of a prospective longitudinal clinical study reported in the December 15 issue of Spine. (Buchner, 2007) See also Chronic pain programs, early intervention; Chronic pain programs, intensity; Chronic pain programs, opioids; and Functional restoration programs. Criteria for the general use of multidisciplinary pain management programs: "Outpatient pain rehabilitation programs may be considered medically necessary when all of the following criteria are met: 1) An adequate and thorough evaluation has been made, including baseline functional testing so follow-up with the same test can note functional improvement; (2) Previous methods of treating chronic pain have been unsuccessful and there is an absence of other options likely to result insignificant clinical improvement; (3) The patient has a significant loss of ability to function independently resulting from the chronic pain; (4) The patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted (if a goal of treatment is to prevent or avoid controversial or optional surgery, a trial of 10 visits may be implemented to assess whether surgery may be avoided); (5) The patient exhibits motivation to change, and is willing to forgo secondary gains, including disability payments to effect this change; and (6) Negative predictors of success above have been addressed." With 10 additional days, the patient will exceed the maximum requirement. Therefore, the request for Functional restoration program 10 additional days is not medically necessary.