

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0021260 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 02/10/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 08/22/2011 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 03/25/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 12/30/2014 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 02/03/2015 |

### 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 43 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/22/2011. She reports a fall from a ladder and back pain. Diagnoses include cervical and thoracic strain, cervical disc herniation and lumbar stain with instability, status post anterior lumbar decompression and fusion of lumbar 5-sacral 1. Treatments to date include chiropractic care, acupuncture, physical therapy and medication management. A progress note from the treating provider dated 12/22/2014 indicates the injured worker reported low back and right leg pain. On 12/30/2014, Utilization Review non-certified the request for Zofran 8mg #10 and modified the request for Flexeril 10mg-Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #90 to #30 and Norco 10/325mg #90 to #45, citing MTUS, ACOEM and Official Disability Guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Zofran 8mg #10:** Upheld

**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; Antiemetics

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation zofran

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested medication. Per the Official Disability Guidelines section on Ondanset, the medication is indicated for the treatment of nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy, radiation therapy or post-operatively. The medication is not indicated for the treatment of nausea and vomiting associated with chronic opioid use. The patient does not have a malignancy diagnosis. There is also no indication that the patient has failed more traditional first line medication such as promethazine or Compazine. For these reasons the request is not certified.

**Flexeril 10mg #90 -Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxant Page(s): 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) Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril, Amrix, Fexmid, generic available): Recommended for a short course of therapy. Limited, mixed-evidence does not allow for a recommendation for chronic use. 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.

**Norco 10/325mg #90:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 91.

**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 non-opioid 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. There is no documentation of subjective improvement in pain such as VAS score improvement on medications. There is also no objective measure of improvement in function. For these reasons the criteria set forth above of ongoing and continued used of opioids have not been met. Therefore, the request is not certified.