MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0129024		
Date Assigned:	07/15/2015	Date of Injury:	02/27/2001
Decision Date:	09/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/02/2015

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: Massachusetts
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 59-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 02/27/2001. The injured worker was diagnosed with cervical intervertebral disc with myelopathy, lumbar intervertebral disc with myelopathy, sciatica, degenerative joint disease of the knees and periarthritis of the shoulder. The injured worker is status post cervical fusion at C5-C6 (no date documented), arthroscopy of the left knee followed by a total knee replacement in November 2013, right total knee replacement in June 2010 and arthroscopy of the bilateral shoulders (no date documented). Treatment to date has included diagnostic testing with recent lumbar spine magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) in March 2015, surgery to multiple body parts, physical therapy sessions and medications. According to the physician's progress report on June 11, 2015, the injured worker continues to experience right and left anterior knee pain currently rated at 6/10. The discomfort at its worst is 9/10 and at its best is 5/10. The injured worker also reports insomnia. Examination demonstrated tenderness to palpation at the bilateral anterior knees, lumbar, bilateral sacroiliac, sacral, right buttock, right posterior leg, right posterior knee and calf. Lumbar spine noted range of motion at 35 degrees flexion, 15 degrees extension, bilateral lateral flexion and rotation at 10 degrees. McMurray's was positive bilaterally. Shoulder and upper extremity range of motion and motor strength was decreased according to the computerized evaluation system. Current medications documented were Norco and topical analgesics. Treatment plan consists of X-rays of the left ankle, hinged knee brace bilaterally, follow-up with pain management and the current request for Norco 10/325mg, Compound medication: FCL-Flurbiprofen 20%, Baclofen 2%, Dexamethasone 2%, Menthol 2%, Camphor 2%, Capsaicin

0.0375%, Hyaluronic acid 0.20%, orthopedic evaluation for the bilateral knees, lumbar epidural steroid injection and physical therapy for the bilateral knees twice a week for three weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lumbar epidural steroid injections: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines criteria for the use of epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Epidural Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: Accordingly, to the MTUS, epidural steroid injections are recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain (defined as pain in dermatome distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy). See specific criteria for use below. Most current guidelines recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. This is in contradiction to previous generally cited recommendations for a "series of three" ESIs. These early recommendations were primarily based on anecdotal evidence. Research has now shown that, on average, less than two injections are required for a successful ESI outcome. Current recommendations suggest a second epidural injection if partial success is produced with the first injection and a third ESI is rarely recommended. Epidural steroid injection can offer short-term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. There is little information on improved function. The American Academy of Neurology recently concluded that epidural steroid injections may lead to an improvement in radicular lumbosacral pain between 2 and 6 weeks following the injection, but they do not affect impairment of function or the need for surgery and do not provide long-term pain relief beyond 3 months, and there is insufficient evidence to make any recommendation for the use of epidural steroid injections to treat radicular cervical pain. (Armon, 2007) See also Epidural steroid injections, "series of three."Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007). 8) Current research does not support "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or the therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections.

According to the documents available for review, the IW does have physical exam findings, pain complaints that are corroborated by imaging studies and as required by the MTUS above, however, there is no specific level identified for the injection. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

Orthopedic evaluation-bilateral knees: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 127,Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 24.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM Chapter 13 on knee complaints indicates that specialized treatments or referrals require a rationale for their use. According to the documents available for review, there is no rationale provided to support the referral to an orthopedic evaluation. Therefore, at this time the requirements for treatment have not been met, and medical necessity has not been established.

Post operative physiotherapy-bilateral knees, 2 times a week for 3 weeks: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 99.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98.

Decision rationale: Physical Medicine is recommended as indicated below. Passive therapy (those treatment modalities that do not require energy expenditure on the part of the injured worker) can provide short-term relief during the early phases of pain treatment and are directed at controlling symptoms such as pain, inflammation and swelling and to improve the rate of healing soft tissue injuries. They can be used sparingly with active therapies to help control swelling, pain and inflammation during the rehabilitation process. Active therapy is based on the philosophy that therapeutic exercise and/or activity are beneficial for restoring flexibility, strength, endurance, function, range of motion, and can alleviate discomfort. Active therapy requires an internal effort by the individual to complete a specific exercise or task. This form of therapy may require supervision from a therapist or medical provider such as verbal, visual and/or tactile instruction(s). Injured workers are instructed and expected to continue active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. Home exercise can include exercise with or without mechanical assistance or resistance and functional activities with assistive devices. (Colorado, 2002) (Airaksinen, 2006) Injured worker-specific hand therapy is very important in reducing swelling, decreasing pain, and improving range of motion in CRPS. (Li, 2005) The use of active treatment modalities (e.g., exercise, education, activity modification) instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. In a large case series of injured workers with low back pain treated by physical therapists, those adhering to guidelines for active rather than passive

treatments incurred fewer treatment visits, cost less, and had less pain and less disability. The overall success rates were 64.7% among those adhering to the active treatment recommendations versus 36.5% for passive treatment. (Fritz, 2007)Physical Medicine Guidelines -Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeksNeuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2): 8-10 visits over 4 weeks; Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks; According to the documents available for review, it is unclear what the nature and extent of the prior surgery involved nor the date or previous courses of PT. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

Compound medication: FCL-Flurbiprofen 20%, Baclofen 2%, Dexamethasone 2%, Menthol 2%, Camphor 2%, Capsaicin 0.0375%, Hyaluronic acid 0.20%, 180grams: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topicals Page(s): 111.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of topical compounded creams. It also contains menthol, a non-recommended topical agent. 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. Topical analgesics are largely experimental and there are a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

Norco 10/325mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 76-80, 91, 124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-97.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines section on Opioids, On-Going Management, p 74-97, (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the injured worker's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life.

Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the injured worker's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain injured workers 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. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the injured worker should be requested to keep a pain dairy that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or in injured worker treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Additionally, the MTUS states that continued use of opioids requires (a) the injured worker has returned to work, (b) the injured worker has improved functioning and pain. There is no current documentation of baseline pain, pain score with use of opioids, functional improvement on current regimen, side effects or review of potentially aberrant drug taking behaviors as outlined in the MTUS and as required for ongoing treatment. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.