

Case Number:	CM15-0036918		
Date Assigned:	03/05/2015	Date of Injury:	10/20/2003
Decision Date:	04/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/26/2015

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: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 57 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on October 20, 2003. The injured worker had reported a low back injury. The diagnoses have included lumbago, lumbar sprain, post laminectomy syndrome of the lumbar spine, thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis unspecified, degeneration of thoracic or thoracolumbar intervertebral disc and displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy. Treatment to date has included medications, radiological studies, ice, heat, acupuncture treatments, a lumbar discectomy in 1990 and a lumbar fusion in 2004. Current documentation dated January 14, 2015 notes that the injured worker reported intermittent moderate low back pain. Physical examination of the lumbar spine revealed tenderness to palpation of the lumbosacral spine area with spasms. Range of motion was noted to be painful and restricted. Straight leg raise was positive bilaterally. Patrick Fabere's test was also positive. On February 2, 2015 Utilization Review non-certified a request for Norco 10/325 mg # 120 and Robaxin 750 mg # 60. The MTUS, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #120: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: With regard to this request, the California Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the following about on-going management with opioids: "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 nonadherent) 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." Guidelines further recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improvement in function and reduction in pain. In the progress reports available for review, the requesting provider did not adequately document monitoring of the four domains. Improvement in function was not clearly outlined. The MTUS defines this as a clinical significant improvement in activities of daily living or a reduction in work restrictions. Furthermore, there did not appear to be adequate monitoring for aberrant behaviors such as querying the CURES database, risk stratifying patients using metrics such as ORT or SOAPP, or including results of random urine toxicology testing. Based on the lack of documentation, medical necessity of this request cannot be established at this time. Although this opioid is not medically necessary at this time, it should not be abruptly halted, and the requesting provider should start a weaning schedule as he or she sees fit or supply the requisite monitoring documentation to continue this medication.

Robaxin 750mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-66.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for methocarbamol (Robaxin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the methocarbamol. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested methocarbamol (Robaxin) is not medically necessary.