

Case Number:	CM15-0200059		
Date Assigned:	10/15/2015	Date of Injury:	11/04/2014
Decision Date:	11/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/12/2015

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, Oregon, Washington
Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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(n) 50 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11-4-14. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar spine grade 2 spondylolisthesis at L5-S1 with right sided L5 radiculopathy. Subjective findings (4-1-15, 5-6-15) indicated low back pain with radiating pain down the right lower extremity. Objective findings (4-1-15, 5-6-15) revealed normal lumbar range of motion and spasms in the lower lumbar area. There is no documentation of current pain level or pain levels with and without medications. As of the PR2 dated 9-16-15, the injured worker reports increased pain and spasms to the lower back with numbness across her left lower extremity and cramping down her left leg. Objective findings include normal lumbar range of motion and spasms in the lower lumbar area. Current medications include Flexeril (since at least 5-6-15), Ultram (since at least 5-6-15), Motrin (since at least 9-16-15) and Neurontin. Treatment to date has included a home exercise program, Ambien and Celebrex. The Utilization Review dated 10-9-15, non-certified the request for Ultram 50mg #120, Motrin 800mg #90 and Flexeril 10mg #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ultram 50mg QTY 120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids, specific drug list, Weaning of Medications.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, specific drug list.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines pages 93-94, specific drug list, Tramadol is a synthetic opioid affecting the central nervous system. Tramadol is indicated for moderate to severe pain. Tramadol is considered a second line agent when first line agents such as NSAIDs fail. There is insufficient evidence in the records of 5/6/15 and 9/16/15 of failure of primary over the counter non-steroids or moderate to severe pain to warrant Tramadol. Therefore use of Tramadol is not medically necessary and it is noncertified. A recent Cochrane review found that this drug decreased pain intensity, produced symptom relief and improved function for a time period of up to three months but the benefits were small (a 12% decrease in pain intensity from baseline). Adverse events often caused study participants to discontinue this medication, and could limit usefulness. There are no long-term studies to allow for recommendations for longer than three months. (Cepeda, 2006) Similar findings were found in an evaluation of a formulation that combines immediate-release vs. extended release Tramadol. Adverse effects included nausea, constipation, dizziness/vertigo and somnolence. (Burch, 2007) Guidelines recommend 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. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Motrin 800mg QTY 90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: According to the CA/MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 67, NSAIDs, specific recommendations are for Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that

cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) In this case review of the medical records from 5/6/15 and 9/16/15 there is insufficient evidence to support functional improvement on Ibuprofen or osteoarthritis to warrant usage. Therefore the determination is non-certification. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Flexeril 10mg QTY 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril).

Decision rationale: According to the CA MTUS, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Cyclobenzaprine, pages 41-42 "Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy. Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) is more effective than placebo in the management of back pain; the effect is modest and comes at the price of greater adverse effects. The effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. (Browning, 2001) Treatment should be brief. There is also a post-op use. The addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended." In this particular case the patient has no evidence in the records of 5/6/15 and 9/16/15 of functional improvement, a quantitative assessment on how this medication helps, percentage of relief lasts, increase in function, or increase in activity. Therefore chronic usage is not supported by the guidelines. Therefore is not medically necessary and non-certified.