

Case Number:	CM15-0065487		
Date Assigned:	04/13/2015	Date of Injury:	01/07/1999
Decision Date:	06/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/06/2015

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: Arizona, Michigan

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:

This 42 year old woman sustained an industrial injury on 1/7/1999. The mechanism of injury is not detailed. Diagnoses include low back pain. Treatment has included oral medications and surgical intervention. Physician notes dated 2/18/2014 show complaints of pain in the low to mid back rated 4/10. Recommendations include lumbar spine MRI, Norco, and Nucynta ER.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Lumbar epidural injection: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

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

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, ESI's are recommended as an option for the treatment of radicular pain. Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and /or electrodiagnostic testing. The purpose of the ESI is to reduce pain and

inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs and avoiding surgery. The treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 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. A review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me did not reveal documentation of evidence of radiculopathy on physical exam that is corroborated by imaging studies or electrodiagnostic testing and without this information medical necessity is not established.

Gabapentin 300mg #90 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy drugs (AED's) Page(s): 16-22.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, anti-epilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. Gabapentin is considered first line treatment for neuropathic pain. The choice of specific agents reviewed below will depend on the balance between effectiveness and adverse reactions. A "good" response to the use of AEDs has been defined as a 50% reduction in pain and a "moderate" response as a 30% reduction. It has been reported that a 30% reduction in pain is clinically important to patients and a lack of response of this magnitude may be the "trigger" for the following: (1) a switch to a different first-line agent (TCA, SNRI or AED are considered first-line treatment); or (2) combination therapy if treatment with a single drug agent fails. (Eisenberg, 2007) (Jensen, 2006) After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. A review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me did not reveal documentation of improvement in pain and function with the use Gabapentin and without this information medical necessity for continued use is not established.

Diazepam 10mg #20: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Benzodiazepines Page(s): 24.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not recommend long-term use of benzodiazepines, long term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Tolerance to all of its effects develop within weeks to months, and long term use may actually increase anxiety, a more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. A review of the

injured workers medical records failed to reveal a clear rationale for or benefit from the use of this medication, therefore the continued use of Diazepam is not medically necessary.

Percocet 5/325mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96 (78, 89, 95).

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, opioids should be discontinued if there is no overall improvement in function, unless there are extenuating circumstances, Opioids should be continued if the patient has returned to work or has improved functioning and pain. Ongoing management actions should include prescriptions from a single practitioner, taken as directed and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. Documentation should follow the 4 A's of analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors. Long-term users of opioids should be regularly reassessed. In the maintenance phase, the dose should not be lowered if it is working. Also, patients who receive opioid therapy may sometimes develop unexpected changes in their response to opioids, which includes development of abnormal pain, change in pain pattern, persistence of pain at higher levels than expected when this happens opioids can actually increase rather than decrease sensitivity to noxious stimuli. It is important to note that a decrease in opioid efficacy should not always be treated by increasing the dose or adding other opioids, but may actually require weaning. A review of the injured workers medical records did not reveal documentation of pain or functional improvement according to MTUS recommendations for ongoing management with opioids and therefore medical necessity for continued use is not established.

1 Urine drug screen: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing Page(s): 43. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) / Urine Drug testing.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Drug testing is recommended as an option, using a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs before a therapeutic trial of opioids, during ongoing management and to avoid misuse/ addiction. Per the ODG, frequency of urine drug testing should be based on documented evidence of risk stratification including use of a testing instrument. A review of the injured workers medical records did not reveal documentation of risk stratification and without this information medical necessity for Urine Drug Test is not established.