

Case Number:	CM14-0123178		
Date Assigned:	08/08/2014	Date of Injury:	01/25/2001
Decision Date:	09/23/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/12/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/05/2014

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 Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture & Pain Medicine 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:

A 51y/o female injured worker with date of injury 1/25/01 with related low back pain. Per progress report dated 5/8/14, the injured worker reported worsening low back pain on the right side, radiating down legs in L5 distribution to the feet. Objective findings included tenderness to palpation at the L4 and L5 levels. MRI of the lumbar spine (date unknown) revealed L4-L5 and L5-S1 disc herniation with nerve root impingement at L4-L5. The documentation submitted for review did not state whether physical therapy was utilized. Treatment to date has included medication management. The date of UR decision was 7/10/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 50mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78-84.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "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 As' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of tramadol. There isn't any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. UDS report dated 1/27/14 was present in the documentation and consistent with prescribed medications. However, there is no documentation comprehensively addressing the aforementioned concerns in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Norco 10/325mg #120: 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): 78, 91.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "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 As' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Norco. Nor, is there any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. UDS report dated 1/27/14 was present in the documentation and consistent with prescribed medications. However, there is no documentation comprehensively addressing the aforementioned concerns in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to

discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Lunesta 3mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines/mental illness and stress chapter - Eszopicolone (Lunesta).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Insomnia Treatment.

Decision rationale: The MTUS is silent on the treatment of insomnia. With regard to insomnia treatment, the ODG guidelines state "Non-Benzodiazepine sedative-hypnotics (Benzodiazepine-receptor agonists): First-line medications for insomnia. This class of medications includes zolpidem (Ambien and Ambien CR), zaleplon (Sonata), and eszopicolone (Lunesta). Benzodiazepine-receptor agonists work by selectively binding to type-1 benzodiazepine receptors in the CNS. All of the benzodiazepine-receptor agonists are schedule IV controlled substances, which mean they have potential for abuse and dependency. Although direct comparisons between benzodiazepines and the non-benzodiazepine hypnotics have not been studied, it appears that the non-benzodiazepines have similar efficacy to the benzodiazepines with fewer side effects and short duration of action." Per progress report dated 5/8/14, it is stated that the patient has poor sleep secondary to pain. The documentation submitted for review do not contain information regarding sleep onset, sleep maintenance, sleep quality, and next-day functioning. It was not noted whether simple sleep hygiene methods were tried and failed. The request is not medically necessary.