

Case Number:	CM15-0105030		
Date Assigned:	06/09/2015	Date of Injury:	10/25/2000
Decision Date:	07/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/01/2015

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 injured worker is a 58-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 10/25/00. The injured worker has complaints of neck pain; low back pain and right hip pain. The documentation noted that sensory examination reveals dull, diminished sensation to light touch over the C3, C4 and C5 dermatomes bilaterally. The diagnoses have included displacement of cervical intervertebral disc without myelopathy; neuropathic pain of the upper and lower extremities and failed neck surgery syndrome. Treatment to date has included norco; soma; MS contin; baclofen; injections and physical therapy. The request was for senna 8.6mg #120 and baclofen 20mg #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Senna 8.6mg #120: Overturned

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, Opioid induced constipation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 77.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioid therapy states: (a) Intermittent pain: Start with a short-acting opioid trying one medication at a time. (b) Continuous pain: extended-release opioids are recommended. Patients on this modality may require a dose of "rescue" opioids. The need for extra opioid can be a guide to determine the sustained release dose required. (c) Only change 1 drug at a time. (d) Prophylactic treatment of constipation should be initiated. The patient is currently on opioid therapy. The use of constipation measures is advised per the California MTUS. The requested medication is used in the treatment of constipation. Therefore the request is medically necessary.

Baclofen 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 63, 64.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: 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) (Van Tulder, 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) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.