MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0039639		
Date Assigned:	03/10/2015	Date of Injury:	03/10/2014
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/03/2015

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: Texas, Florida, California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 36 year old female, who sustained a work related injury on 3/10/14. She has suffered accumulative injury to neck, shoulders, wrists and hands from repetitive activities. The diagnosis has included bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. Treatments to date have included 4 physical therapy sessions, medications and EMG upper extremities. In the Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness dated 1/23/15, the injured worker complains of worsening pain in arms with pain that radiates to elbows and shoulders accompanied by tingling and swelling in her hands. The treatment plan is recommending a general orthopedic consultation, a MRI of cervical spine, a trial of physical therapy to bilateral wrists and hands, she is to wear bilateral wrist braces and a discussion on medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Orthopedic consultation for the bilateral wrists: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 5 Cornerstones of Disability Prevention and Management Page(s): and Chapter 7, primarily page 127.

Decision rationale: ACOEM Guidelines, Chapter 7, Page 127, state that the occupational health practitioner may refer to other specialists if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. A referral may be for consultation to aid in the diagnosis, prognosis, therapeutic management, determination of medical stability, and permanent residual loss and/or the examinee's fitness for return to work. A consultant is usually asked to act in an advisory capacity, but may sometimes take full responsibility for investigation and/or treatment of an examinee or patient. This request for the orthopedic consult fails to specify the concerns to be addressed in the independent or expert assessment, including the relevant medical and non-medical issues, diagnosis, causal relationship, prognosis, temporary or permanent impairment, work capability, clinical management, and treatment options. At present, the request is not certified.

MRI of the cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 179-180. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck and Upper Back Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): Primarily page 303, regarding imaging.

Decision rationale: Although there is subjective information presented in regarding increasing pain, there are no accompanying physical signs. The case would therefore not meet the MTUS-ACOEM criteria for spine/cervical magnetic imaging, due to the lack of objective, unequivocal neurologic physical examination findings documenting either a new radiculopathy, or a significant change in a previously documented radiculopathy. The guides state: Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminate imaging will result in false positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. The request is appropriately non-certified.

Physical therapy twice a week for four weeks for the bilateral wrists: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 114. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 & 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 98 of 127.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does permit physical therapy in chronic situations, noting that one should allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. The conditions mentioned are Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks; Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD9 729.2) 8-10 visits over 4 weeks; and Reflex sympathetic dystrophy (CRPS) (ICD9 337.2): 24 visits over 16 weeks. This claimant does not have these conditions. And, after several documented sessions of therapy, it is not clear why the patient would not be independent with self-care at this point. Also, there are especially strong caveats in the MTUS/ACOEM guidelines against over treatment in the chronic situation supporting the clinical notion that the move to independence and an active, independent home program is clinically in the best interest of the patient. They cite: 1. Although mistreating or under treating pain is of concern, an even greater risk for the physician is over treating the chronic pain patient. Over treatment often results in irreparable harm to the patient's socioeconomic status, home life, personal relationships, and quality of life in general. 2. A patient's complaints of pain should be acknowledged. Patient and clinician should remain focused on the ultimate goal of rehabilitation leading to optimal functional recovery, decreased healthcare utilization, and maximal self actualization. This request for more skilled, monitored therapy was appropriately non-certified.

Medication panel: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 & 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 43 of 127.

Decision rationale: This appears to be a request for a drug panel. Regarding urine drug testing, the MTUS notes in the Chronic Pain section: Recommended as an option, using a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs. For more information, see Opioids, criteria for use: (2) Steps to Take Before a Therapeutic Trial of Opioids & (4) On-Going Management; Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction; Opioids, screening for risk of addiction (tests); & Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction. There is no mention of suspicion of drug abuse, inappropriate compliance, poor compliance, drug diversion or the like. There is no mention of possible adulteration attempts. The patient appears to be taking the medicine as directed, with no indication otherwise. It is not clear what drove the need for this drug test. The request is appropriately non-certified under MTUS criteria.

LidoPro topical ointment 4oz: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 112-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Per the 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 & 9792.26 Page(s): 112 of 127.

Decision rationale: LidoPro is a combination of Capsaicin 0.0325%, Lidocaine 4.5%, Menthol 10%, and the primary component is the topical analgesic, Methyl Salicylate 27.5%. The MTUS notes topical analgesic compounds are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Experimental treatments should not be used for claimant medical care. MTUS notes they are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed, but in this case, it is not clear what primary medicines had been tried and failed. Also, there is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended, is not certifiable. This compounded medicine contains several medicines untested in the peer review literature for effectiveness of use topically. Moreover, the MTUS notes that 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. The provider did not describe each of the agents, and how they would be useful in this claimant's case for specific goals. The request is appropriately non-certified.