

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0068162		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/20/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/22/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/24/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/24/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/10/2015

### 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 45 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 2/22/2002. She reported injuries to her spine and left leg from a motor vehicle accident. Diagnoses have included somatization disorder, dysthymia with anxiety, learning disorder, and personality disorder. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, psychotherapy and medication. According to the Agreed Medical Re-examination dated 3/12/2015, the injured worker complained of weakness, fatigue, sleep difficulties, irritability, lack of energy, mood swings, and feeling sad and discouraged. She complained of headaches most days. She also complained of pain in her neck, back and arms. Her low back pain went down into the back of her legs. Authorization was requested for psychotherapy, one PEMF-SomaPulse P2a device, and one prescription of Meperidine.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**One (1) psychotherapy:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cognitive Behavioral Therapy.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines psychological therapy Page(s): s 101-102.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on psychological treatment states: Recommended for appropriately identified patients during treatment for chronic pain. Psychological intervention for chronic pain includes setting goals, determining appropriateness of treatment, conceptualizing a patient's pain beliefs and coping styles, assessing psychological and cognitive function, and addressing co-morbid mood disorders (such as depression, anxiety, panic disorder, and posttraumatic stress disorder). Cognitive behavioral therapy and self regulatory treatments have been found to be particularly effective. Psychological treatment incorporated into pain treatment has been found to have a positive short- term effect on pain interference and long-term effect on return to work. The following "stepped- care" approach to pain management that involves psychological intervention has been suggested: Step 1: Identify and address specific concerns about pain and enhance interventions that emphasize self-management. The role of the psychologist at this point includes education and training of pain care providers in how to screen for patients that may need early psychological intervention. Step 2: Identify patients who continue to experience pain and disability after the usual time of recovery. At this point a consultation with a psychologist allows for screening, assessment of goals, and further treatment options, including brief individual or group therapy. Step 3: Pain is sustained in spite of continued therapy (including the above psychological care). Intensive care may be required from mental health professions allowing for a multidisciplinary treatment approach. See also Multi-disciplinary pain programs. See also ODG Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) Guidelines (Otis, 2006) (Townsend, 2006) (Kerns, 2005) (Flor, 1992) (Morley, 1999) (Ostelo, 2005). Psychological treatment in particular cognitive behavioral therapy has been found to be particularly effective in the treatment of chronic pain. As this patient has continued ongoing pain, this service is indicated per the California MTUS and thus is medically necessary.

**One (1) PEMF - SomaPulse P2a device:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic), Low Back, Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), low back, PEM therapy.

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested service. The ODG, states the requested treatment is not recommended due to an alc of evidence in the literature of efficacy for electromagnetic field stimulation. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

**One (1) prescription of Meperidine 50mg, #100:** Upheld

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

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

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: 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 diary 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. When to Continue Opioids (a) If the patient has returned to work. (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant improvement in VAS scores. There are also no objective measurements of improvement in function. Therefore criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.