

Case Number:	CM15-0074589		
Date Assigned:	04/24/2015	Date of Injury:	01/06/2013
Decision Date:	06/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/20/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 52 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 01/06/2013. The initial complaints and diagnoses were not mentioned in the clinical notes. Treatment to date has included conservative care, medications, and physical therapy. Currently, the injured worker complains of constant back pain that fluctuates with activity. Current medications include Vimovo and Voltaren. The injured worker was discharged from physical therapy on 11/18/2014 after completing previous authorized sessions without meeting goals. The diagnoses include low back syndrome, lumbosacral disc degeneration, and lumbar spondylosis. The treatment plan consisted of 12 sessions of continued physical therapy for the lumbar spine, pain management evaluation for lumbar epidural steroid injections, new medications (Mobic and Zanaflex), and follow-up. A physical therapy discharge summary dated November 30, 2014 states that the patient underwent 12 visits and plateaued.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Mobic 15 mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS Page(s): 22, 67-68.

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): 67-72 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Mobic (meloxicam), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that Naproxen is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale), or any objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Mobic (meloxicam) is not medically necessary.

Zanaflex 2 mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 47, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxant Page(s): 66.

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): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for tizanidine (Zanaflex), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that tizanidine specifically is FDA approved for management of spasticity; unlabeled use for low back pain. Guidelines recommend LFT monitoring at baseline, 1, 3, and 6 months. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the tizanidine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. Finally, it does not appear that there has been appropriate liver function testing, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested tizanidine (Zanaflex), is not medically necessary.

Pain management evaluation for LESI: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20-9792.26 Page(s): 46 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Pain management evaluation for LESI, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that epidural injections are recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain, defined as pain in dermatomal distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy, and failure of conservative treatment. Guidelines recommend that no more than one interlaminar level, or to transforaminal levels, should be injected at one session.

Regarding repeat epidural injections, guidelines state that 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. Within the documentation available for review, there are no recent subjective complaints or objective examination findings supporting a diagnosis of radiculopathy. Additionally, there are no imaging or electrodiagnostic studies corroborating the diagnosis of radiculopathy. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Pain management evaluation for LESI is not medically necessary.

12 additional sessions of physical therapy: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 300. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Back Chapter, Physical Medicine.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 298, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 98 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for additional physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior PT sessions, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, when added to the number of therapy sessions previously provided, the request exceeds the amount of PT recommended by the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested additional physical therapy is not medically necessary.