

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0117515		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/25/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/13/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/11/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/18/2015

### 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: Emergency 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 27-year-old male with an industrial injury dated 06/13/2014. The injured worker's diagnoses include degeneration of lumbar or lumbosacral intervertebral disc, cervicgia, cervical radiculopathy, lumbago and left arm pain. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 05/15/2015, the injured worker reported diffused neck pain with radiation down the left arm. The injured worker also reported back pain and left arm pain. Objective findings revealed tenderness with bilateral facet loading with muscle spasms and decrease range of motion in the cervical, thoracic and lumbar spine. Tenderness was also noted in the left upper extremity. The treating physician prescribed services for bilateral medial branch block L2, L3, L4, L5 with fluoroscopy and sedation times 2, Amitriptyline 25mg #60, Cyclobenzaprine 10mg #60, Ibuprofen 800mg #90 and Norco 10mg #120 now under review.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Bilateral medial branch block L2, L3, L4, L5 with fluoroscopy and sedation times 2:**

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) Facet joint intra-articular injections (therapeutic blocks).

**Decision rationale:** The request is for the use of a facet joint medial branch block to aid in pain relief. Specific qualifying criteria are needed based on the guidelines. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this topic. The ODG guidelines state the following: 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 therapy. In this case, the patient does not meet the criteria as stated above. No more than 2 joint levels should be blocked at one time. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

**Amitriptyline 25mg #60 --:** 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) Antidepressants for chronic pain.

**Decision rationale:** Medications in the class of Tricyclic antidepressants are recommended as a first line option for neuropathic pain, and as a possibility for non-neuropathic pain. (Feuerstein, 1997) (Perrot, 2006) They are generally considered a first-line agent unless they are ineffective, poorly tolerated, or contraindicated. Analgesia generally occurs within a few days to a week, whereas antidepressant effect usually takes longer to occur. (Saarto-Cochrane, 2005) Assessment of treatment efficacy should include not only pain outcomes, but also an evaluation of function, changes in use of other analgesic medication, sleep quality/duration, and psychological assessment. Side effects can include excessive sedation and should be assessed. It is recommended that these outcome measurements should be initiated at one week of treatment with a recommended trial of at a minimum of 4 weeks. It has been suggested that if pain is in remission for 3-6 months, a gradual tapering of anti-depressants can be undertaken. In this case, the use of this medication is not certified for use based on the lack of documented assessment of screening measures for ongoing use. Pending submission of the required treatment efficacy and evaluation of function as well as psychological assessment, the request is not medically necessary.

**Cyclobenzaprine 10mg #60:** 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 Page(s): 63 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Due to inadequate qualifying evidence for use of a muscle relaxant, the request is not medically necessary.

**Ibuprofen 800mg #90:** 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 Page(s): 67-68 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** The request is for the use of NSAIDs to aid in pain relief. NSAIDs are usually used to aid in pain and inflammation reduction. The MTUS guidelines states that for osteoarthritis NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen especially for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to support one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects, with COX-2 NSAIDs having fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects. The FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain and function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) For back pain, NSAIDs are recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. (Van Tulder, 2006) (Hancock, 2007) For patients with acute low back pain with sciatica a recent Cochrane review (including three heterogeneous randomized controlled trials) found no differences in treatment with NSAIDs vs. placebo. In patients with axial low back pain this same review found that NSAIDs were not more effective than acetaminophen for acute low-back pain, and that acetaminophen had fewer side effects. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) The addition of NSAIDs or spinal manipulative therapy does not appear to increase recovery in patients with acute low back pain over that received with acetaminophen treatment and advice from their physician. (Hancock, 2007) In this case,

there is inadequate documentation of functional improvement to justify continued use, as the guidelines recommend the lowest dose for the shortest period of time. The significant side effect profile of medications in this class put the patient at risk when used chronically. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

**Norco 10mg #120:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines  
Page(s): 78 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** The request is for the use of a medication in the opioid class. The MTUS guidelines state that for ongoing treatment with a pharmaceutical in this class, certain requirements are necessary. This includes not only adequate pain control, but also functional improvement. Four domains have been proposed for management of patients on opioids. This includes pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. In this case, there is inadequate documentation of persistent functional improvement, which should eventually lead to medication discontinuation. The records also do not reveal screening measures as discussed above for continued use of a medication in the opioid class. As such, the request is not medically necessary.