

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0146622		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/07/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/16/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/03/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/21/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/28/2015

### 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 37-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 6-16-09. In a follow up physiatry pain evaluation report dated 7-2-15, the treating physician notes complaints of pain in the neck and lower back radiating to the right upper and lower extremity. Pain is rated at 8 out of 10 without medication and at 3 out of 10 with medication. Medications are Norco, Robaxin, Nortriptyline and Relafen. The impression is chronic myofascial sprain and strain of lumbosacral spine, degenerative disc of lumbosacral spine, and lumbar radiculopathy. Cervical spine range of motion is within normal limits but is painful in all directions. There is tenderness to palpation of the lumbosacral spine and paraspinal muscle stiffness. Lumbar spine range of motion is painful but within normal limits. Straight leg raise sitting and supine is right 60 degrees and left 90 degrees. Radicular pain in L4-L5 distribution with decreased sensation and weakness is noted. His gait is antalgic. A random urine drug screen was done. He is permanent and stationary. Previous treatment noted is medication, hot packs and ice packs, and a home exercise program. The plan is Norco 10-325mg #60 one every 12 hours as needed for pain, Robaxin 750mg one at bedtime as needed for spasm and sleep, Nortriptyline 25mg one at bedtime for neuropathic pain, Relafen 750mg #60 one twice a day with food, and continue the home exercise program. The requested treatment is Robaxin 750mg #30 and Norco 10-325mg #60.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Robaxin 750mg #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 64-66.

**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. In addition, 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 certified. Therefore, the requested treatment is not medically necessary.

**Norco 10/325mg #60:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids for Chronic Pain Page(s): 80.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 76-84.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (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 for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring

the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to nonopioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse.

When to Continue Opioids (a) If the patient has returned to work; (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox- AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. These criteria are met in the provided medical records for review and thus the request is certified. Therefore, the requested treatment is medically necessary.