

Case Number:	CM15-0047514		
Date Assigned:	03/19/2015	Date of Injury:	08/11/1998
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/12/2015

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

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 53-year-old female who sustained a work related injury August 11, 1998. History included chronic depression, anxiety, microdiscectomy L5-S1 April 2011 and left leg varicosity cauterization, June 2014. According to a physician's progress notes, dated November 5, 2014, the injured worker presented for scheduled follow-up with long standing history of back and foot pain. Diagnoses are documented as lumbar disc herniation; post-laminectomy syndrome, lumbar region; lumbar radicular pain; spondylosis of unspecified site without mention of myelopathy. Treatment included documentation to continue Dilaudid, Morphine, and Soma. A request for authorization dated December 23, 2014, requests follow-up visits x 3 and requests for medication not specified.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Follow visits times 3: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, Office visits.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for three follow-up visits, California MTUS does not specifically address the issue. ODG cites that "the need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self care as soon as clinically feasible." Within the documentation available for review, while a follow-up visit would be appropriate to monitor the patient's progress and make necessary changes to the treatment plan, the need for multiple follow-up visits cannot be predicted with a high degree of certainty, as the need for follow-up will depend in part on the findings from each prior visit. Unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the request to allow for an appropriate amount of office visits at this time. In light of the above issues, the currently requested three follow-up visits are not medically necessary.

Dilaudid 4 mg #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R.9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Dilaudid, California Pain, Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Dilaudid is not medically necessary.

Morphine Sulfate ER 15 mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R.9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for morphine sulfate ER, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested morphine sulfate ER is not medically necessary.

Soma 350 mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R.9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for carisoprodol (Soma), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of non-sedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that Soma specifically is not recommended for more than 2 to 3 weeks. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement because of the carisoprodol. 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 carisoprodol (Soma) is not medically necessary.