

Case Number:	CM14-0121075		
Date Assigned:	08/06/2014	Date of Injury:	06/09/2010
Decision Date:	02/19/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/18/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/31/2014

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: Maryland, Texas, Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Allergy and Immunology, Rheumatology

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 54 year old male with date of injury of 6/9/10. The patient is being treated for cervical spine sprain/strain with left upper extremity radiculitis, lumbar spine sprain/strain with bilateral lower extremity radiculitis, disc bulge at L3-4 and central canal stenosis at L5-A1 with facet hypertrophy at L3-4 and L5-S1. Subjective findings 4/7/14 include neck and low back symptoms. Objective findings include tenderness of cervical spine, paravertebral muscles, trapezius muscle, limited neck ROM, lumbar spine tendness on paravertebral muscles, lumbar spine junction and right sciatic notch, + straight leg raise on right and limited lumbar spine ROM. Subsequent exams reveal decreased sensation over right L5-S1 dermatome. The patient was reported to have had an MRI but results are not available here. Treatment thus far has consisted of acupuncture, medications (tramadol, Zanaflex, Pamelor). The Utilization Review (UR) on 7/18/14 found the request for Ultram 50mg #120 to be modified to facilitate weaning off this medication due to lack of documentation of functional improvement on this medication. The request for Zanaflex 4mg #60 to be modified to facilitate weaning due to chronic use which is not recommended by MTUS and no objectional functional improvement demonstrated on this medication.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ultram 50mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 13.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Tramadol, Ultram Page(s): 74-96, 113, 123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram[®]).

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/acetaminophen." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. As such, the request for Ultram 50mg #120 is not medically necessary.

Zanaflex 4mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxant Page(s): 63,66.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants, Zanaflex Page(s): 63-67.

Decision rationale: Zanaflex is the brand name version of tizanidine, which is a muscle relaxant. MTUS states concerning muscle relaxants "Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (VanTulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. These drugs should be used with caution in patients driving motor vehicles or operating heavy machinery. Drugs with the most limited published evidence in terms of clinical effectiveness include chlorzoxazone, methocarbamol, dantrolene and baclofen. (Chou, 2004) According to a recent review in American Family Physician, skeletal muscle relaxants are the most widely prescribed drug class for musculoskeletal conditions (18.5% of prescriptions), and the most commonly prescribed antispasmodic agents are carisoprodol, cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, and methocarbamol, but

despite their popularity, skeletal muscle relaxants should not be the primary drug class of choice for musculoskeletal conditions. (See 2, 2008)."MTUS further states, "Tizanidine (Zanaflex, generic available) is a centrally acting alpha2-adrenergic agonist that is FDA approved for management of spasticity; unlabeled use for low back pain. (Malanga, 2008) Eight studies have demonstrated efficacy for low back pain. (Chou, 2007) One study (conducted only in females) demonstrated a significant decrease in pain associated with chronic myofascial pain syndrome and the authors recommended its use as a first line option to treat myofascial pain. (Malanga, 2002) May also provide benefit as an adjunct treatment for fibromyalgia. (ICSI, 2007)." Long term use of muscle relaxers are not recommended by the MTUS. As such, the request for Zanaflex 4mg #60 is not medically necessary.