

Case Number:	CM14-0077031		
Date Assigned:	07/18/2014	Date of Injury:	05/08/2003
Decision Date:	09/16/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/16/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/27/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in Nevada. 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:

The records, presented for review, indicate that this 59-year-old female was reportedly injured on May 8, 2003. The mechanism of injury was not listed in these records reviewed. The most recent progress note, dated May 7, 2014, indicated that there were ongoing complaints of low back pain radiating to the left lower extremity. The physical examination demonstrated decreased sensation and muscle strength in the left lower extremity. There were no muscle spasms or trigger points present in the lumbar spine. There was a positive piriformis stretch test bilaterally. There was also an examination of the right shoulder, which indicated decreased right shoulder range of motion in flexion and abduction. Diagnostic imaging studies were not reviewed during this visit. Previous treatment included trigger point injections, shoulder surgery, low back surgery, and chiropractic care. A request had been made for hydrocodone/acetaminophen and Flexeril and was not certified in the pre-authorization process on May 16, 2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Prescription of Hydrocodone-Acetaminophen 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 Page(s): 88.

Decision rationale: Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is a short acting opiate indicated for the management of moderate to severe breakthrough pain. The California MTUS guidelines support short-acting opiates at the lowest possible dose to improve pain and function, as well as the ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use and side effects. The injured employee has chronic pain; however, there is no objective clinical documentation of improvement in the pain or function with the current regimen. As such, this request for Norco is not medically necessary.

1 Prescription of Flexeril 5mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 63-66.

Decision rationale: Flexeril is a muscle relaxant. According to the California Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, muscle relaxants are indicated as a second line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of chronic low back pain. According to the most recent progress note, the injured employee does not have any complaints of acute exacerbations nor are there any spasms present on physical examination. For these reasons, this request for Flexeril is not medically necessary.