

Case Number:	CM15-0029878		
Date Assigned:	02/23/2015	Date of Injury:	02/08/2009
Decision Date:	04/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/17/2015

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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:

This 58 year old male sustained an industrial injury on 2/8/09, with subsequent ongoing low back pain. Treatment included epidural steroid injections (11/25/14) and medications. Magnetic resonance imaging lumbar spine (1/14/14) showed a tear in the posterior annulus with stenosis and entrapment of the right L4 nerve as well as a posterior disc and osteophyte complex at L5-S1 with L5 nerve displacement. In a PR-2 dated 1/13/15, the injured worker complained of low back pain 10/10 on the visual analog scale without medications with muscle spasms and episodes of sudden sharp pain down the left leg. The injured worker reported that recent epidural steroid injection helped with pain, but two weeks after the injection the right lower extremity pain returned. On 12/25/14, the injured worker developed persistent severe left lower extremity pain. Physical exam was remarkable for independent ambulation with normal gait. Current diagnoses included chronic low back pain, lumbar discogenic pain, right L5 radiculopathy and chronic pain syndrome. The treatment plan included obtaining an updated magnetic resonance imaging lumbar spine prior to referral to a spine surgeon, Flexeril as a short term treatment of back pain flare up and refilling Tramadol. On 1/24/15, Utilization Review modified a request for Tramadol ER 150 mg #60 to Tramadol ER 150 mg #40 and Flexeril 7.5 mg #60 to Flexeril 7.5 mg #40 and noncertified a request for magnetic resonance imaging lumbar spine citing CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines and ODG guidelines. As a result of the UR denial, an IMR was filed with the Division of Workers Comp.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI lumbar spine: 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).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: MTUS and ACOEM recommend MRI, in general, for low back pain when cauda equine, tumor, infection, or fracture are strongly suspected and plain film radiographs are negative, MRI test of choice for patients with prior back surgery. ACOEM additionally recommends against MRI for low back pain before 1 month in absence of red flags. ODG states, Imaging is indicated only if they have severe progressive neurologic impairments or signs or symptoms indicating a serious or specific underlying condition, or if they are candidates for invasive interventions. Immediate imaging is recommended for patients with major risk factors for cancer, spinal infection, cauda equina syndrome, or severe or progressive neurologic deficits. Imaging after a trial of treatment is recommended for patients who have minor risk factors for cancer, inflammatory back disease, vertebral compression fracture, radiculopathy, or symptomatic spinal stenosis. Subsequent imaging should be based on new symptoms or changes in current symptoms. The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam, objective testing, or subjective complaints) any red flags, significant worsening in symptoms or other findings suggestive of the pathologies outlined in the above guidelines. As such, the request for MRI lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

Flexeril 7.5 mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 67-68.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine Page(s): 60-66. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril®) Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: UpToDate, Flexeril.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment states for Cyclobenzaprine, "Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy. The effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. (Browning, 2001) Treatment should be brief." The medical documents indicate that patient is far in excess of the initial treatment window and period. Additionally, MTUS outlines that "Relief of pain with the use of medications is generally temporary, and measures of the lasting benefit from this modality should include evaluating the effect of pain relief in relationship to improvements in function and increased activity. Before prescribing any medication for pain the following should occur: (1) determine the aim of use of the medication; (2) determine the potential benefits and adverse

effects; (3) determine the patient's preference. Only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) UpToDate "Flexeril" also recommends "Do not use longer than 2-3 weeks". Medical documents do not fully detail the components outlined in the guidelines above and do not establish the need for long term/chronic usage of cyclobenzaprine. ODG states regarding cyclobenzaprine, Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy. The addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended. One other pain medication is being requested, along with cyclobenzaprine, which ODG recommends against. As such, the request for Flexeril 7.5mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150 mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 76-80.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®).

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that a therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals. ODG further states, Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/acetaminophen. The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. The original utilization review recommended weaning and modified the request, which is appropriate. As such, the request for tramadol #60 is not medically necessary.