

Case Number:	CM14-0109636		
Date Assigned:	09/16/2014	Date of Injury:	01/12/2004
Decision Date:	12/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/19/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/15/2014

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. 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: 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:

This is a 58 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 1-12-2004. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for thoracic and lumbar spine radiculitis. According to the progress report dated 12-9-2013, the injured worker complained of lower and mid back pain. He complained of burning and tingling sensations, which affected his ability to sleep. He rated his ongoing pain 5-6 out of 10. He reported that medications decreased his overall pain and improved his functional ability. Objective findings (12-0-2013) revealed paravertebral tenderness in the thoracic spine and lumbar spine with guarded range of motion. Treatment has included diagnostic studies and medications. The injured worker has been prescribed Norco, Soma and Halcion since at least 12-2013. The treating physician indicates (12-9-2013) that the urinalysis from 1-2013 was consistent with current regimen. There is a request for authorization dated 4-1-2014 for medications. The original Utilization Review (UR) (6-19-2014) denied requests for Norco, Soma, Halcion, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the thoracic and lumbar spine and a urinalysis. Utilization Review modified a request for Neurontin to #10.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco (dosage & quantity unknown): 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): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: The MTUS recommends Norco for moderate to moderately severe pain. Opioids for chronic pain appears to be efficacious but limited for short-term pain relief, and long-term efficacy is unclear, but also appears limited. If the patient does not respond to a time-limited course of opioids it is suggested that an alternate therapy be considered. For the on-going management of opioids there should be documentation of pain relief, functional improvement, appropriate use and side effects. The request is non-specific for dose, sig, and amount of medication; consequently, Norco (dosage & quantity unknown) is not medically necessary.

Soma #120: 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): Carisoprodol (Soma).

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that carisoprodol is not recommended and is not indicated for long-term use. Abuse has been noted for sedative and relaxant effects. In regular abusers, the main concern is the accumulation of meprobamate. There was a 300% increase in numbers of emergency room episodes related to carisoprodol from 1994 to 2005. There is little research in terms of weaning of high dose carisoprodol and there is no standard treatment regimen for patients with known dependence. Soma #120 is not medically necessary.

Neurontin 300 mg (quantity unknown): 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): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that gabapentin is an anti-epilepsy drug, which has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain. An adequate trial period for gabapentin is three to eight weeks for titration, then one to two weeks at maximum tolerated dosage. With each office visit, the patient should be asked if there has been a change in the patient's pain symptoms, with the recommended change being at least 30%. There is documentation of functional improvement with the continued use of this medication. At present, based on the records provided, and the evidence-based guideline review, the request is medically

reasonable. However, the request is non-specific for sig and amount of medication; consequently, Neurontin 300 mg (quantity unknown) is not medically necessary.

Halcion 25 mg (quantity unknown): 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): Benzodiazepines.

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that benzodiazepines are not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic, anxiolytic, anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant. Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. Tolerance to hypnotic effects develops rapidly. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. The request is non-specific for sig and amount of medication; consequently, Halcion 25 mg (quantity unknown) is not medically necessary.

MRI of the thoracic spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Neck and Upper Back Complaints 2004. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Neck and Upper Back (Acute & Chronic) chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: The Official Disability Guidelines state that indications for a thoracic MRI include trauma, thoracic pain suspicious for cancer or infection, cauda equina syndrome, or myelopathy. The exam indicates that the patient has complaining of mid back pain without evidence of long track signs, bowel or bladder dysfunction, or progressive neurologic deficit. There is no documentation of any of the above criteria supporting a recommendation of a thoracic MRI. MRI of the thoracic spine is not medically necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Low Back-Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic) chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Low Back Complaints 2004, Section(s): Special Studies.

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. The medical record fails to document sufficient findings indicative of nerve root compromise, which would warrant an MRI of the lumbar spine. MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

1 Urinalysis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain (Chronic).

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS recommends using a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs, a step to take before a therapeutic trial of opioids, to aid in the ongoing management of opioids, or to detect dependence and addiction. There is no documentation in the medical record that a urine drug screen was to be used for any of the above indications. 1 Urinalysis is not medically necessary.