MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0129412		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2015	Date of Injury:	07/10/2008
Decision Date:	08/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/03/2015

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: North Carolina
Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on July 10, 2008. The initial diagnosis or symptoms experienced, by the injured worker, were not included in the documentation. Treatment to date has included medication, x-rays, MRI, nerve conduction study, urine drug screen and physical therapy. Currently, the injured worker complains of low back pain rated at 5-6 on 10. He reports pain, numbness and tingling in right lower extremity that occasionally goes to the right knee. The pain is exacerbated by standing and any activity. The pain is alleviated by lying down. The injured worker is currently diagnosed with lumbosacral region degenerative disc disease, lumbar disc herniation, lumbago, chronic pain syndrome, displacement of intervertebral disc (site unspecified) without myelopathy, thoracic lumbosacral radicular syndrome, lumbar spinal stenosis, degeneration of intervertebral disc (site unspecified), Schmori's node (lumbar region), depression and obesity. His work status is permanent and stationary. Notes dated February 2, 2015, March 9, 2015, April 7, 2015, May 5, 2015 and June 2, 2015 indicate the injured worker experiences approximately a 60% reduction in pain with the medications. He is able to engage in activities of daily living, increased ability to walk, sit and stand for longer periods of time and his overall function is improved with the medication. The June 2, 2015 note also states the injured worker has not received any therapeutic benefit from physical therapy. The following, urine drug screen (to monitor compliance and efficacy) and bilateral L3, L4 and L5 medical nerve branch block for L4-L5 and L5-S1 facet joints due to complaint of axial pain, failed conservative treatment its diagnostic properties of the injection are being requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Urine drug screen: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain, Criteria for Use of Urine Drug Testing.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (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 patient'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 patient'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 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. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient 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 inpatient 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. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. The California MTUS does recommend urine drug screens as part of the criteria for ongoing use of opioids .The patient was on opioids at the time of request and therefore the request is medically necessary.

Bilateral L3, L4 and L5 medial nerve branch block for the L4-L5 and L5-S1 facet joints: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300-301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back, Facet joint injections.

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

Decision rationale: The ACOEM states: Invasive techniques (e.g., local injections and facet-joint injections of cortisone and lidocaine) are of questionable merit. Although epidural steroid injections may afford short-term improvement in leg pain and sensory deficits in patients with nerve root compression due to a herniated nucleus pulposus, this treatment offers no significant long term functional benefit, nor does it reduce the need for surgery. Despite the fact that proof is still lacking, many pain physicians believe that diagnostic and/or therapeutic injections may have benefit in patients presenting in the transitional phase between acute and chronic pain. Per the ODG, facet joint injections are under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are currently not recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence based reviews as their benefit remains controversial. Criteria for use of diagnostic blocks for facet nerve pain: 1. One set of diagnostic medial branch blocks is required with a response of 70%. 2. Limited to non-radicular cervical pain and no more than 2 levels bilaterally. 3. Documentation of failure of conservative therapy 4. No more than 2 joint levels are injected in 1 session. 5. Diagnostic facet blocks should be performed in patients whom a surgical procedure is anticipated. The requested service is not recommended per the ACOEM or the Official Disability Guidelines. Criteria cited above have not been met in the clinical documentation as the patient has radicular pain symptoms on exam and therefore the request is not medically necessary.