

Case Number:	CM15-0126691		
Date Assigned:	07/13/2015	Date of Injury:	01/07/2014
Decision Date:	09/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/26/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2015

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, Indiana, Oregon
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This injured worker is a 36-year-old female who reported an industrial injury on 1/7/2014. Her diagnoses, and or impression, were noted to include: left carpal tunnel syndrome. No current imaging studies were noted. Her treatments were noted to include diagnostic studies; medication management with toxicology screenings; and rest from work. The progress notes of 5/18/2015 reported a follow-up evaluation for complaints, which included a flare-up of left elbow and left wrist pain, unrelieved by the ointment prescribed. Objective findings were noted to include: weakness in the left grip with positive cubital tunnel and positive left carpal tunnel. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include left carpal tunnel release surgery with pre-operative clearance, and post-operative physical therapy and medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left Carpal Tunnel Release: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): table 11-4.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Carpal Tunnel.

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines, electrodiagnostic testing is required to evaluate for carpal tunnel and stratify success in carpal tunnel release. In addition, the guidelines recommend splinting and medications as well as a cortisone injection to help facilitate diagnosis. The Official Disability Guidelines were also referenced for more specific recommendations. According to the Official Disability Guidelines regarding surgery for carpal tunnel syndrome, Recommended after an accurate diagnosis of moderate or severe CTS. Surgery is not generally initially indicated for mild CTS unless symptoms persist after conservative treatment. Severe CTS requires all of the following: Muscle atrophy, severe weakness of thenar muscles, 2-point discrimination test greater than 6 mm and positive electrodiagnostic testing. Not severe CTS requires all the following: Symptoms of pain, numbness, paresthesia, impaired dexterity requiring two of the following: Abnormal Katz hand diagram scores, nocturnal symptoms, Flick sign (shaking hand); findings by physical exam, requiring two of the following including compression test, Semmes-Weinstein monofilament test, Phalen's sign, Tinel's sign, decreased 2-point discrimination, mild thenar weakness, (thumb adduction); comorbidities of no current pregnancy; initial conservative treatment requiring three of the following: Activity modification greater than or equal to one month, night wrist splint greater than or equal to one month, nonprescription analgesia (i.e. acetaminophen), home exercise training (provided by physician, healthcare provider or therapist) or successful initial outcome from corticosteroid injection trial and positive electrodiagnostic testing. In this case, the EMG shows mild CTS and no injection has been trialed yet. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Initial Post-Operative Physical Therapy (12-sessions, 2 times a week for 6-weeks): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre-Operative Clearance: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg, #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 Opioids Page(s): 80.

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, opioids should be continued if the patient has returned to work and the patient has improved functioning and pain. Based upon the records reviewed there is insufficient evidence to support chronic use of narcotics. In this case, there is lack of demonstrated functional improvement, percentage of relief, demonstration of urine toxicology compliance or increase in activity due to medications. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Zofran 8mg, #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines are silent on the issue of Zofran for postoperative use. According to the ODG, Pain Chapter, Ondansetron (Zofran) is not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. In this case, the submitted records demonstrate no evidence of nausea and vomiting or increased risk for postoperative issues. Therefore, determination is not medically necessary.

Keflex 500mg, #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Stulberg DL, Penrod MA, Blatny RA. Common bacterial skin infections. Am Fam Physician. 2002 Jul 1; 66 (1): 119-24.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines and ODG are silent on the issue of Keflex. An alternative guideline was utilized. According to the American Family Physician Journal, 2002 July 1; 66 (1): 119-125, titled "Common Bacterial Skin Infections"; Keflex is often the drug of choice for skin wounds and skin infections. It was found from a review of the medical record submitted of no evidence of a wound infection to warrant antibiotic prophylaxis. The request for Keflex is therefore not medically necessary and appropriate.

Docusate 100mg, #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS/ACOEM Guidelines are silent on the issue of stool softeners. According to the ODG Pain section, opioid induced constipation treatment, if prescribing opioids has been determined to be appropriate, then ODG recommends, under Initiating Therapy, that Prophylactic treatment of constipation should be initiated. In this case the constipating medications are not medically necessary, so the stool softener is not medically necessary.