

Case Number:	CM15-0096572		
Date Assigned:	05/26/2015	Date of Injury:	02/26/2010
Decision Date:	09/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/19/2015

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: Indiana

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 54 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 2/26/2010. Diagnoses have included greater trochanteric bursitis, lumbar spine degenerative disc disease and left lower extremity radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, chiropractic treatment, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), trigger point injections and medication. According to the progress report dated 3/4/2015, the injured worker reported reduced left hip pain after an injection on 11/25/2014. She reported that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs helped with pain. She complained of low back pain rated five out of ten. Authorization was requested for physical therapy for the lumbar spine, Cyclo-Tramadol cream, Prilosec and Naproxen.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Physical Therapy 0xwk x 0 wk (12 sessions): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines Page(s): 98-99.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back-Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines refer to physical medicine guidelines for physical therapy and recommends as follows: "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." Additionally, ACOEM guidelines advise against passive modalities by a therapist unless exercises are to be carried out at home by patient. ODG quantifies its recommendations with 10 visits over 8 weeks for lumbar sprains/strains and 9 visits over 8 weeks for unspecified backache/lumbago. ODG further states that a "six-visit clinical trial" of physical therapy with documented objective and subjective improvements should occur initially before additional sessions are to be warranted. Medical records indicate he had an initial trial. However, there is insufficient documentation noting the functional and pain level improvements and other parameters required by the guidelines. As such, the request for 12 sessions of physiotherapy is not medically necessary.

Physical Therapy 0xwk x 0 wk (12 sessions): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines Page(s): 98-99.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical medicine Page(s): 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Physical Therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines refer to physical medicine guidelines for physical therapy and recommends as follows: "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." Additionally, ACOEM guidelines advise against passive modalities by a therapist unless exercises are to be carried out at home by patient. ODG quantifies its recommendations with 10 visits over 8 weeks for lumbar sprains/strains and 9 visits over 8 weeks for unspecified backache/lumbago. ODG further states that a "six-visit clinical trial" of physical therapy with documented objective and subjective improvements should occur initially before additional sessions are to be warranted. Medical records indicate he had an initial trial. However, there is insufficient documentation noting the functional and pain level improvements and other parameters required by the guidelines. As such, the request for 12 sessions of physiotherapy is not medically necessary.

Cyclo Tramadol Cream: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "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 recommended." MTUS states that the only FDA-approved NSAID medication for topical use includes diclofenac, which is indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints. Tramadol would not be indicated for topical use in this case. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG states, "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." And "Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease: (1) A non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg omeprazole daily) or misoprostol (200 g four times daily); or(2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44)." The medical documents provided do not establish the patient as having documented GI bleeding/perforation/peptic ulcer or other GI risk factors as outlined in MTUS. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Naproxen 550mg #60: 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 NSAIDs Page(s): 67-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Naproxen, NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain, Acute exacerbations of chronic pain:

Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) Back Pain, Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. 4) Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. Additionally, the treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Progress notes do not indicate how long the patient has been on naproxen, but the MTUS guidelines recommend against long-term use. Dyesthesia pain is present, but as MTUS outlines, the evidence for NSAID use in neuropathic pain is inconsistent. As such, the request is not medically necessary.