

Case Number:	CM15-0117227		
Date Assigned:	06/25/2015	Date of Injury:	07/22/2011
Decision Date:	08/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/17/2015

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, 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:

The injured worker is a 33 year old female who sustained a work related injury July 22, 2011. According to a primary treating physician's progress report, dated May 12, 2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of constant and severe pain to the left greater than the right wrist and hand with swelling, numbness, tingling, and weakness. She reports the pain is getting progressively worse and she is waiting for authorization for steroid injections for the bilateral wrists and hands. Objective findings included; visible swelling and 2+ edema noted on the left and right wrist and hand. Right wrist range of motion; flexion 35 degrees, extension 40 degrees, radial deviation 10 degrees and ulnar deviation 15 degrees. Left wrist range of motion; flexion 45 degrees, extension 45 degrees, radial deviation 15 degrees and ulnar deviation 20 degrees. There is tenderness over distal radial ulnar junction, positive Phalen's and Tinel's, abnormal two point discrimination of the median nerve and weak grip strength of the left and right wrist/hand. Diagnosis is documented as bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. Treatment plan included request for authorization for Functional Capacity Evaluation, Prilosec, topical creams, and Tylenol 4.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tylenol 4 #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 75-80.

Decision rationale: Tylenol #4 contains codeine, an opioid pain medication. With regard to this request, the California Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the following about ongoing management with opioids: "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 for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs." Guidelines further recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improvement in function and reduction in pain. In the progress reports available for review, the requesting provider did not adequately document monitoring of the four domains. Improvement in function was not clearly outlined. The MTUS defines this as a clinical significant improvement in activities of daily living or a reduction in work restrictions. Although there are the results of random urine toxicology testing, this type of monitoring by itself does not meet criteria for opioid continuation. Based on the lack of documentation, medical necessity of this request cannot be established at this time. Although this opioid is not medically necessary at this time, it should not be abruptly halted, and the requesting provider should start a weaning schedule as he or she sees fit or supply the requisite monitoring documentation to continue this medication.

Prilosec 20mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines PPIs Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: In this request, there is controversy over whether a PPI is warranted in this worker's treatment regimen. The Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines on page 68-69 states the following regarding the usage of proton pump inhibitors (PPI): "Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." In the case of this injured worker, there is no documentation of any of the risk factors above including age, history of multiple NSAID use, history of gastrointestinal ulcer or bleeding, or use of concomitant anticoagulants or corticosteroids. Given this, this request is not medically necessary.

Topical creams: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009), state on pages 111-113: Topical Analgesics Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenic amines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The use of these compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. Within the documentation available for review, none of the above mentioned criteria have been documented. Most important, the active ingredient of this topical formulation is not specified in the RFA dated 3/31/15. Without this, an individual assessment of each active ingredient to verify if this formulation is appropriate cannot be carried out. In light of the above issues, the currently requested topical creams is not medically necessary.

FCE: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Fitness for Duty Chapter, Functional Capacity Evaluation and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines ACOEM, Chapter 7, p. 137-138.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for functional capacity evaluation, ACOEM Practice Guidelines state that there is not good evidence that functional capacity evaluations are correlated with a lower frequency of health complaints or injuries. ODG states that functional capacity evaluations are recommended prior to admission to a work hardening program. The criteria for the use of a functional capacity evaluation includes case management being hampered by complex issues such as prior unsuccessful return to work attempts, conflicting medical reporting on precautions and/or fitness for modified job, or injuries that require detailed explanation of a worker's abilities. Additionally, guidelines recommend that the patient be close

to or at maximum medical improvement with all key medical reports secured and additional/secondary conditions clarified. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that there has been prior unsuccessful return to work attempts, conflicting medical reporting, or injuries that would require detailed exploration. Given this, the currently requested functional capacity evaluation is not medically necessary.