

Case Number:	CM15-0141749		
Date Assigned:	07/31/2015	Date of Injury:	02/07/2014
Decision Date:	09/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/21/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 44 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 2-7-2014. She slipped and fell down a flight of stairs. She has reported chronic pain and has been diagnosed with pain in joint lower leg right knee contusion, sprain and strain of neck, sprain strain thoracic region, sprain strain lumbar region. Treatment has included medications, physical therapy, medical imaging, modified work duty, and a functional restoration program. Gait was antalgic and ambulated into the room without any assistance. MRI of the cervical spine dated 8-15-2014 noted a normal cervical spine and asymmetrically enlarged left thyroid lobe. MRI of the lumbar spine dated 9-3-2014 revealed partially visualized pelvic mass which appears uterine in origin, possibly related to enlarge uterine fibroids. The mass is incompletely evaluated on this exam. Further evaluation with pelvic ultrasound is recommended if this is not a known finding. L4-L5 annular bulge with a central annular fissure. Mild effacement of the thecal sac and bilateral foraminal stenosis. The treatment plan included medications. The treatment request included Orphenadrine, gabapentin, and morphine sulfate.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Gabapentin 600mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy Drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines AEDs Page(s): 16-21.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for Gabapentin (Neurontin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that anti-epilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that after initiation of treatment, there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Additionally, there is no discussion regarding side effects from this medication. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.

Orphenadrine-Norflex ER 100mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain).

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

Decision rationale: With regard to the request for Orphenadrine, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that non-sedating muscle relaxants are recommended with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic low back pain. Specifically regarding Norflex (Orphenadrine), the guidelines state: "This drug is similar to diphenhydramine, but has greater anticholinergic effects. The mode of action is not clearly understood. Effects are thought to be secondary to analgesic and anticholinergic properties. Side Effects: Anticholinergic effects (drowsiness, urinary retention, dry mouth). Side effects may limit use in the elderly. This medication has been reported in case studies to be abused for euphoria and to have mood elevating effects." In the submitted medical records available for review, the patient was previously on Baclofen and now prescribed Norflex. It does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Orphenadrine is not medically necessary.

Morphine sulf ER 30mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids
Page(s): 75-80.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for MS Contin (Morphine Sulfate ER), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that MS Contin is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement), and no documentation regarding side effects. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested MS Contin (Morphine Sulfate ER) is not medically necessary.