

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0187792		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/18/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/09/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/07/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/07/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/12/2014

### 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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine, and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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 patient is a 47-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on December 9, 2013. Subsequently, the patient developed a chronic back pain. According to a progress report dated on October 26, 2014, the patient was complaining of low back pain with a severity rated between 6-9/10. The patient physical examination demonstrated antalgic gait, lumbar tenderness with reduced range of motion, cervical tenderness with reduced range of motion. The patient was treated with pain medications for pain and insomnia. The provider requested authorization for the following medications.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Tramadol 50 mg, ninety count:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 93 - 94.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol;Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 113; 76-79.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. Although, Ultram may be needed to help with the patient pain, it may not help with the weaning process from opioids.

Ultram could be used if exacerbation of pain after or during the weaning process. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: 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 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. There is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement with previous use of opioids (Tramadol). There no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tramadol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medication. There is no clear justification for the need to continue the use of Tramadol. Therefore, the prescription of Tramadol 50 mg, ninety count is not medically necessary.

**Ambien 6.25 mg, sixty count:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) < Non-Benzodiazepine sedative-hypnotics (Benzodiazepine-receptor agonists (<http://worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/pain.htm>

**Decision rationale:** Ambien is a non-benzodiazepine hypnotic agent that is a pyrrolopyrazine derivative of the cyclopyrrolone class. According to MTUS guidelines, tricyclic antidepressants are recommended as a first line option in neuropathic pain, especially if pain is accompanied by insomnia, anxiety or depression. According to ODG guidelines, 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. Ambien could be used as an option to treat insomnia; however it should not be used for a long-term without periodic evaluation of its need. There is no recent documentation that the patient is suffering from insomnia. There is no clear justification for a continuous use of Ambien. There is

no characterization of the patient sleep problems or attempt of non pharmacological treatment of the patient insomnia. Therefore, the prescription of Ambien is not medically necessary.

**Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 mg, sixty count:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 64.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine Page(s): 41.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, an non sedating muscle relaxants is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case does not have clear evidence of acute exacerbation of chronic back pain and spasm and the prolonged use of Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg is not justified. Evidence based guidelines do not recommend its use for more than 2-3 weeks. The request is not medically necessary.

**Menthoderm gel, 120 ml:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 105 and 111.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

**Decision rationale:** Mentoderm contains methyl salicylate 15% and menthol 10%. According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended. Mentoderm (menthol and methyl salicylate) contains menthol a topical analgesic that is not recommended by MTUS. Furthermore, there is no documentation of the patient's intolerance of oral anti-inflammatory medications. Based on the above, Mentoderm is not medically necessary.

**MRI of the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the indications for imaging in case of back pain, MTUS guidelines stated: Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks. However, it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management. 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. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures). Furthermore, and according to MTUS guidelines, MRI is the test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, fracture or tumors that may require surgery. The patient does not have any clear evidence of lumbar radiculopathy or nerve root compromise. There is no change of the clinical examination requiring new imaging studies. There is no change in the patient signs or symptoms suggestive of new pathology. Therefore, the request for MRI of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

**MRI of the cervical spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck and Upper Back Chapter

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 182.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, MRI of the cervical spine is recommended in case of red flags suggesting cervical spine damage such as tumor, infection, cervical root damage and fracture. There is no documentation of any of these red flags in this case. Therefore the request for MRI of the cervical spine is not medically necessary.