

Case Number:	CM15-0048267		
Date Assigned:	03/20/2015	Date of Injury:	09/04/2012
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/13/2015

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: 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 47 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/4/12. He reported pain in the lower back. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbago and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included lumbar MRI, EMG/NCV study and oral medications. As of the PR2 dated 2/26/15, the injured worker reports 8/10 pain in the lower back that is aggravated by bending, lifting, twisting and other activity. The treating physician noted palpable paravertebral tenderness and spasms in the lumbar spine. The treating physician requested Fenoprofen Calcium 400mg, Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg, Omeprazole 20mg and Tramadol 150mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Fenoprofen Calcium (Nalfon) 400 mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 71.

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): 67-72 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for fenoprofen, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale), or any objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested fenoprofen is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride 7.5 mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 41.

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 cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril), 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. Guidelines go on to state that cyclobenzaprine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the cyclobenzaprine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. Finally, there is no documentation of failure of first-line treatment options, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) is not medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20 mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68-69.

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): 68-69 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for omeprazole (Prilosec), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested omeprazole (Prilosec) is not medically necessary.

Tramadol 150 mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 93-94.

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 tramadol, 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 tramadol is not medically necessary.