

Case Number:	CM15-0201100		
Date Assigned:	10/19/2015	Date of Injury:	02/13/2001
Decision Date:	12/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/13/2015

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: Emergency Medicine

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 2-13-2001. A review of medical records indicates the injured worker is being treated for lumbar radiculopathy, left greater than right, recurrent symptomatology since 1-2012. Medical records dated 8-14-2015 noted progressive back pain over the last month or two. Current complaints were low back pain with radiation to the lower extremities, greater to the left. With medication, pain was a 6-7 out of 10 and without medication, 10 out of 10. Medications do allow him to do activities of daily living including walking. Physical examination noted loss of lordosis. There was slight to moderate paralumbar muscle spasm, left greater than right. There was decreased lumbar range of motion. Treatment has included therapy, Methadone, Lidocaine, Colace, and Baclofen since at least 1-30-2015. Utilization review form dated 9-14-2015 noncertified Methadone 5mg #90, Lidocaine 5%, Baclofen 10mg #90, and Colace 250mg #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Methadone 5mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the opioid class. The MTUS guidelines state that for ongoing treatment with a pharmaceutical in this class, certain requirements are necessary. This includes not only adequate pain control, but also functional improvement. Four domains have been proposed for management of patients on opioids. This includes pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. As part of the pain treatment agreement, it is advised that "Refills are limited, and will only occur at appointments." In this case, there is inadequate documentation of persistent functional improvement seen. "Functional improvement" means either a clinically significant improvement in activities of daily living or a reduction in work restrictions as measured during the history and physical exam, performed and documented as part of the evaluation and management visit and a reduction in the dependency on continued medical treatment. As such, the request is not medically necessary. All opioid medications should be titrated down slowly in order to prevent a significant withdrawal syndrome.

Lidocaine 5% patch: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a Lidoderm patch to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that its use is indicated for post herpetic neuralgia after an initial trial of an anti-epileptic medication. Further research is needed to recommend use for chronic neuropathic disorders besides post-herpetic neuralgia. In this case, the patient does not have a diagnosis documented, which would justify the use of Lidoderm patches. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Baclofen 10mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) In this case, the use of a muscle relaxant is not guideline-supported. This is secondary to poor effectiveness for chronic long-term use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Colace 250mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic)/Opioid-induced constipation treatment.

Decision rationale: The request is for a medication to aid in constipation. The Official Disability Guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Recommended as indicated below. In the section, Opioids, criteria for use, if prescribing opioids has been determined to be appropriate, then ODG recommends, under Initiating Therapy, that Prophylactic treatment of constipation should be initiated. Opioid-induced constipation is a common adverse effect of long-term opioid use because the binding of opioids to peripheral opioid receptors in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract results in absorption of electrolytes, such as chloride, with a subsequent reduction in small intestinal fluid. Activation of enteric opioid receptors also results in abnormal GI motility. Constipation occurs commonly in patients receiving opioids and can be severe enough to cause discontinuation of therapy. First-line: When prescribing an opioid, and especially if it will be needed for more than a few days, there should be an open discussion with the patient that this medication may be constipating, and the first steps should be identified to correct this. Simple treatments include increasing physical activity, maintaining appropriate hydration by drinking enough water, and advising the patient to follow a proper diet, rich in fiber. These can reduce the chance and severity of opioid-induced constipation and constipation in general. In addition, some laxatives may help to stimulate gastric motility. Other over-the-counter medications can help loosen otherwise hard stools, add bulk, and increase water content of the stool. Second-line: If the first-line treatments do not work, there are other second-line options. About 20% of patients on opioids develop constipation, and some of the traditional constipation medications don't work as well with these patients, because the problem is not from the gastrointestinal tract but from the central nervous system, so treating these patients is different from treating a traditional patient with constipation. An oral formulation of methylnaltrexone (Relistor) met the primary and key secondary end points in a study that examined its effectiveness in relieving constipation related to opioid use for noncancer-related pain. The effectiveness of oral methylnaltrexone in this study was comparable to that reported in clinical studies of subcutaneous methylnaltrexone in subjects with chronic noncancer-related pain. There was an 80% improvement in response with the 450 mg dose and a 55% improvement with 300 mg. Constipation drug lubiprostone (Amitiza) shows efficacy and tolerability in treating opioid-induced constipation without affecting patients' analgesic response to the pain medications. Lubiprostone is a locally acting chloride channel activator that has a distinctive mechanism that counteracts the constipation associated with opioids without interfering with the opiates binding to their target receptors. (Bader, 2013) (Gras-Miralles, 2013) See also Tapentadol (Nucynta), which has improved gastrointestinal tolerability for patients complaining of constipation, nausea, and/or vomiting. The FDA has approved methylnaltrexone bromide (Relistor) subcutaneous injection 12 mg/0.6 mL for the treatment of opioid-induced constipation in patients taking opioids for noncancer pain. (FDA, 2014) As stated above, measures to combat constipation for patients on opioids are needed. In this case, the use of this medication is not medically necessary. The patient is currently on a medication in the opioid class with the resultant side effect of constipation. The opioid medication has been non-certified for use. As such, there is lack of need for this medication.