

Case Number:	CM15-0124893		
Date Assigned:	07/15/2015	Date of Injury:	10/29/2014
Decision Date:	10/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/29/2015

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: Emergency 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 injured worker is a 56-year-old female who reported an industrial injury on 10/29/2014. The history notes a previous work injury to the lower back, right shoulder and right leg in 2009; for which the case is noted to be closed with the assistance of an attorney. Her diagnoses, and or impression, were noted to include: cervical/thoracic/lumbar radiculopathy; bilateral shoulder tendinitis; bilateral medial/lateral epicondylitis; bilateral ulnar injury; bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome; bilateral knee sprain, rule-out internal derangement; bilateral plantar fasciitis; bilateral tarsal syndrome; and bilateral De Quervain's. No current imaging studies were noted. Her treatments were noted to include physical therapy; medication management; and rest from work. The progress notes of 3/18/2015 reported the chief complaints to include: neck pain; bilateral shoulder pain; bilateral wrist/hand pain; upper and mid-back pain; low back pain; bilateral knee pain; and bilateral foot pain. Objective findings were noted to include: moderate-severe pain over all of the areas of complaint, aggravated by activities, and/or with associated decreased range-of-motion and positive assessment findings. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include: a large "LSO" brace and bilateral open patella braces; a transcutaneous electrical stimulation unit with supplies; magnetic resonance imaging studies of the cervical and thoracic spine, bilateral knees, shoulders, elbows and wrists; intense neuro-stimulator therapy; physiotherapy, chiropractic and acupuncture treatments; and multiple, (8), medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ketoprofen 20%, 167gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients, which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state that any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. In this case, the compounded topical treatment contains an NSAID. The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. FDA-approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (Diclofenac): Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. In this case, as stated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of a topical NSAID. This is based on the diagnosis and treatment duration. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine 5%, 110gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. Due to inadequate qualifying evidence and prolonged duration of use, the request is not medically necessary.

Synapryn 10mg, 500ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: Synapryn contains Tramadol, which is a pain medication in the category of a centrally acting analgesic. They exhibit opioid activity and a mechanism of action that inhibits the reuptake of serotonin and norepinephrine. Centrally acting drugs are reported to be effective in managing neuropathic type pain although it is not recommended as first line therapy. The side effect profile is similar to opioids. For chronic back pain, it appears to be efficacious for short-term pain relief, but long term (>16 weeks) results are limited. It also did not appear to improve function. The use of Tramadol for osteoarthritis is indicated for short-term use only (<3 months) with poor long-term benefit. In this case, the patient does not meet the qualifying criteria. This is secondary to the duration of use, with this medication being indicated on a short-term basis only. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Tabradol 1mg, 250ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. Due to inadequate qualifying evidence and prolonged duration of use, the request is not medically necessary.

Deprizine 15mg, 250ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of an acid reducing medication. The guidelines do not specifically address or advise the use of an H2 blocker but does make recommendations regarding medications in the same category classified as proton pump inhibitors. This is usually given for patients with esophageal reflux, gastritis, or peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain, which have side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically with a proton pump inhibitor or Misoprostol. Criteria for risk are as follows: (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). Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request is not medically necessary.

Dicopanol 5mg/ml, 150ml: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Mental Illness and Stress/Diphenhydramine (Benadryl).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of Diphenhydramine, which is in the category of an antihistamine. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this topic. The ODG states that it is not recommended. The AGS updated Beers criteria for inappropriate medication use includes diphenhydramine. Anticholinergic drugs, including diphenhydramine, may increase the risk for dementia by 50% in older adults. There is an obvious dose-response relationship between anticholinergic drug use and risk of developing dementia, but chronic use, even at low doses, would be in the highest risk category. While there is awareness that these drugs may cause short-term drowsiness or confusion, which is included in the prescribing information, there is no mention of long-term effects on cognition, and generally awareness of this issue is very low, and both the public and doctors need to be encouraged to use alternative treatments where possible. As stated above, the use of this medication is not indicated for use in this patient for insomnia. There is inadequate documentation of the reasoning for its use for other indications. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Fanatrex 25mg/ml, 420ml: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the category of an anti-epileptic drug (AED). These medications are recommended for certain types of neuropathic pain. Most of the randomized clinical control trials involved include post-herpetic neuralgia and painful polyneuropathy such as in diabetes. There are few trials, which have studied central pain or radiculopathy. The MTUS guidelines state that a good response to treatment is 50% reduction in pain. At least a 30% reduction in pain is required for ongoing use, and if this is not seen, this should trigger a change in therapy. There also should be documentation of functional improvement and side effects incurred with use. Diseases, which prompt use of these medications, include post-herpetic neuralgia, spinal cord injury, chronic regional pain syndrome, lumbar spinal stenosis, post-operative pain, and central pain. There is inadequate evidence to support use in non-specific axial low back pain or myofascial pain. In this case, there is lack of documentation of adequate pain reduction for continued use. The records also do not reveal functional improvement or screening measures as required. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Lumbosacral (LSO) Brace (large): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS General Approaches 2004, Section(s): Prevention.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a lumbar back support to aid in pain relief and injury prevention. The ACOEM guidelines states that the use of a back belts as lumbar support should be avoided because they have been shown to have little or no benefit, thereby providing only a false sense of security. As an alternative, it is advised that prolonged sitting and standing should be reduced by providing rest and exercise breaks and task rotation and variation should be employed. Heavy loads need to be divided and mechanical support devices used. In addition, the workstation can be set up to optimize reduction in back strain. As such, due to poor evidence of its utility and effectiveness, the request is not medically necessary.

TENS Unit with supplies (purchase): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Initial Care.

Decision rationale: The request is for TENS unit use to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that there is no high-grade scientific evidence to support the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of passive physical modalities such as traction, heat/cold applications, massage, diathermy, cutaneous laser treatment, ultrasound, transcutaneous electrical neurostimulation (TENS) units, and biofeedback. These palliative tools may be used on a trial basis but should be monitored closely. Emphasis should focus on functional restoration and return of patients to activities of normal daily living. In this case, the request is not indicated. This is secondary to poor high-grade evidence to support its use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Open Patella Knee Braces (bilateral, large): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Knee Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee and leg/Knee brace.

Decision rationale: The request is for a knee brace. The ODG guidelines state that prefabricated knee braces may be appropriate in patients with one of the following conditions: 1. Knee instability; 2. Ligament insufficiency/deficiency; 3. Reconstructed ligament; 4. Articular defect repair; 5. Avascular necrosis; 6. Meniscal cartilage repair; 7. Painful failed total knee arthroplasty; 8. Painful high tibial osteotomy; 9. Painful unicompartmental osteoarthritis; and/or 10. Tibial plateau fracture. Custom-fabricated knee braces may be appropriate for patients with the following conditions, which may preclude the use of a prefabricated model: 1. Abnormal limb contour; 2. Skin changes; 3. Severe osteoarthritis (grade III or IV); 4. Maximal off-loading of painful or repaired knee compartment (example: heavy patient; significant pain); and/or 5. Severe instability as noted on physical examination of knee. In this case, there is inadequate documentation of a qualifying condition for a knee brace. The records do not reflect severe instability, which would place the patient at risk for falls. Pending receipt of the reasoning why this is necessary, the request is not medically necessary.

Physiotherapy (18-sessions): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Manual therapy & manipulation.

Decision rationale: The request is for physical therapy to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines states that manipulation is recommended for chronic pain if caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Manual Therapy is widely used in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. The intended goal or effect of Manual Medicine is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. Manipulation is manual therapy that moves a joint beyond the physiologic range-of-motion but not beyond the anatomic range-of-motion. It is indicated for low back pain but not ankle and foot conditions, carpal tunnel syndrome, forearm/wrist/hand pain, or knee pain. The use of active treatment modalities instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. Active treatments also allow for fading of treatment frequency along with active self-directed home PT, so that less visits would be required in uncomplicated cases. In this case, the patient would benefit most from at home active therapy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Chiropractic Manipulation (18-sessions): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Manual therapy & manipulation.

Decision rationale: The request is for physical therapy to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines states that manipulation is recommended for chronic pain if caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Manual Therapy is widely used in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. The intended goal or effect of Manual Medicine is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. Manipulation is manual therapy that moves a joint beyond the physiologic range-of-motion but not beyond the anatomic range-of-motion. It is indicated for low back pain but not ankle and foot conditions, carpal tunnel syndrome, forearm/wrist/hand pain, or knee pain. The use of active treatment modalities instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. Active treatments also allow for fading of treatment frequency along with active self-directed home PT, so that less visits would be required in uncomplicated cases. In this case, the patient would benefit most from at home active therapy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Acupuncture (18-sessions): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment 2007.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Initial Care.

Decision rationale: The request is for acupuncture to aid in pain relief. The ACOEM guidelines state the following regarding this topic. Invasive techniques (e.g., needle acupuncture and injection procedures, such as injection of trigger points, facet joints, 2 or corticosteroids, lidocaine, or opioids in the epidural space) have no proven benefit in treating acute neck and

upper back symptoms. In this case the guidelines do not support the use of this treatment modality. This is secondary to the diagnosis with poor clinical evidence regarding efficacy. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

MRI of the Cervical Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back Complaints/MRI.

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI of the cervical spine. The ACOEM guidelines state that when there is physiological evidence of tissue insult or neurological deficits, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding the next steps including MRI imaging. An imaging study may be appropriate in patients where symptoms have lasted greater than 4-6 weeks and surgery is being considered for a specific anatomic defect or to further evaluate the possibility of serious pathology, such as a tumor. Reliance on imaging studies alone to evaluate the source of neck or upper back symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because it's possible to identify a finding that was present before symptoms began and, therefore, has no temporal association with the symptoms. According to the ODG guidelines indications for imaging includes: Chronic neck pain (= after 3 months conservative treatment), radiographs normal, neurologic signs or symptoms present; Neck pain with radiculopathy if severe or progressive neurologic deficit; Chronic neck pain, radiographs show spondylosis, neurologic signs or symptoms present; Chronic neck pain, radiographs show old trauma, neurologic signs or symptoms present; Chronic neck pain, radiographs show bone or disc margin destruction; Suspected cervical spine trauma, neck pain, clinical findings suggest ligamentous injury (sprain), radiographs and/or CT "normal"; Known cervical spine trauma: equivocal or positive plain films with neurological deficit; and Upper back/thoracic spine trauma with neurological deficit. In this case, there is inadequate documentation in a change in neurologic status seen on exam. The records do not indicate new red flags, which would warrant further imaging evaluation. Pending further information regarding new neurologic deficits, the request is not medically necessary.

MRI of the Thoracic Spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back Complaints/MRI.

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI of the thoracic spine. The ACOEM guidelines state that when there is physiological evidence of tissue insult or neurological deficits, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding the next steps including MRI imaging. An imaging study may be appropriate in patients where symptoms have lasted greater than 4-6 weeks and surgery is being considered for a specific anatomic defect or to further evaluate the possibility of serious pathology, such as a tumor. Reliance on imaging studies alone to evaluate the source of neck or upper back symptoms carries a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test

results) because it's possible to identify a finding that was present before symptoms began and, therefore, has no temporal association with the symptoms. According to the ODG guidelines indications for imaging includes: Chronic neck pain (= after 3 months conservative treatment), radiographs normal, neurologic signs or symptoms present; Neck pain with radiculopathy if severe or progressive neurologic deficit; Chronic neck pain, radiographs show spondylosis, neurologic signs or symptoms present; Chronic neck pain, radiographs show old trauma, neurologic signs or symptoms present; Chronic neck pain, radiographs show bone or disc margin destruction; Suspected cervical spine trauma, neck pain, clinical findings suggest ligamentous injury (sprain), radiographs and/or CT "normal"; Known cervical spine trauma: equivocal or positive plain films with neurological deficit; and Upper back/thoracic spine trauma with neurological deficit. In this case, there is inadequate documentation in a change in neurologic status seen on exam. The records do not indicate new red flags, which would warrant further imaging evaluation. Pending further information regarding new neurologic deficits, the request is not medically necessary.