

Case Number:	CM13-0068024		
Date Assigned:	01/03/2014	Date of Injury:	03/13/2000
Decision Date:	11/19/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/16/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/19/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Management and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 58-year-old female with a 3/13/00 date of injury. At the time (11/16/13) of request for authorization for Conzip 100 mg #30, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain radiating to bilateral thigh and objective (trigger points noted on the back) findings. The current diagnosis is chronic lumbosacral strain. The treatment to date includes Motrin and ongoing treatment with Soma. There is no documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and are taken as directed; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Conzip 100 MG #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation
<http://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=2347726f-7755-7026-426c-6f7741776179>

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids
 Page(s): 74-80; 113.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and are taken as directed; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects; as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of Opioids. In addition, specifically regarding Tramadol, MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guideline identifies documentation of moderate to severe pain and Tramadol used as a second-line treatment (alone or in combination with first-line drugs), as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of Tramadol. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of a diagnosis of chronic lumbosacral strain. In addition, there is documentation of Conzip used as a second-line treatment. However, there is no documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and are taken as directed; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Conzip 100 mg #30 is not medically necessary.