

Case Number:	CM15-0026355		
Date Assigned:	02/13/2015	Date of Injury:	12/22/1999
Decision Date:	04/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/11/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 48-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/22/1999. The diagnoses have included lumbar disc disease, lumbar facet syndrome, bilateral sacroiliac joint sprain, bilateral piriformis syndrome, and posterior annular tear at L4-L5. Noted treatments to date have included physical therapy, cognitive behavior therapy, and medications. Diagnostics to date have included MRI of the lumbar spine which showed multilevel degenerative disc disease per progress note. In the same progress note dated 12/16/2014, the injured worker presented with complaints of low back pain. The treating physician reported requesting lumbar medial branch nerve blocks at L4 through S1 levels to determine the origin of the injured worker's pain and urine drug testing to assist in monitoring adherence to a prescription drug treatment regimen. Utilization Review determination on 01/20/2015 non-certified the request for Bilateral L4 through S1 Medial Branch Blocks and Urine Toxicology Screening citing Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines and Official Disability Guidelines.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Bilateral L4 through S1 medial branch block: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 309.

Decision rationale: According MTUS guidelines, “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.” According to ODG guidelines regarding facets injections, “ Under study. Current evidence is conflicting as to this procedure and at this time no more than one therapeutic intra-articular block is suggested. If successful (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). If a therapeutic facet joint block is undertaken, it is suggested that it be used in consort with other evidence based conservative care (activity, exercise, etc.) to facilitate functional improvement. (Dreyfuss, 2003) (Colorado, 2001) (Manchikanti , 2003) (Boswell, 2005) See Segmental rigidity (diagnosis). In spite of the overwhelming lack of evidence for the long-term effectiveness of intra-articular steroid facet joint injections, this remains a popular treatment modality. Intra-articular facet joint injections have been popularly utilized as a therapeutic procedure, but are not currently recommended as a treatment modality in most evidence-based reviews as their benefit remains controversial.” Furthermore and according to ODG guidelines, 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. The ODG guidelines did not support facet injection for lumbar pain in this clinical context. There is no documentation of facet mediated pain or that facets are the main pain generator. There is no documentation of failure of conservative therapies in this patient. Therefore, the request for bilateral L4-S1 medial branch block is not medically necessary.

Urine Toxicology Screening: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction Page(s): 77-78; 94.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, urine toxicology screens is indicated to avoid misuse/addiction. “(j) Consider the use of a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs.” There is no evidence that the patient have aberrant behavior for urine drug screen. There is no clear evidence of abuse, addiction and poor pain control. There is no documentation that the patient has a history of use of illicit drugs. Therefore, the request for retrospective Urine drug screen is not medically necessary.