MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0084555		
Date Assigned:	05/06/2015	Date of Injury:	03/17/2011
Decision Date:	06/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/04/2015

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: Massachusetts
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 52-year-old male injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 03/17/2011. The diagnoses included lumbar radiculopathy with right lower extremity weakness, lumbar disc protrusion, facet arthropathy and lumbar strain/sprain. The injured worker had been treated with medications. On 3/12/2015, the treating provider reported right low back pain radiating to the right buttock and lateral thigh with tenderness and restricted range of motion. The treatment plan included Oxycodone and Flexeril.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Oxycodone 10/325mg 1 tab po q 4h prn-pain #180 with 0 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-97.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines section on Opioids, On-Going Management, p 74-97, (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 injured worker'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 injured worker'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 injured workers 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. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the injured worker should be requested to keep a pain dairy 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 in injured worker 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 nonopioid 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. Additionally, the MTUS states that continued use of opioids requires (a) the injured worker has returned to work, (b) the injured worker has improved functioning and pain. There is current documentation of baseline pain, pain score with use of opioids, functional improvement on current regimen, and review of potentially aberrant drug taking behaviors however; there is no discussion of side effects as outlined in the MTUS and as required for ongoing treatment. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity is not necessary.

Flexeril 10mg 1 tab po tid prn-spasms #90 with 0 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Flexeril Page(s): 41-42.

Decision rationale: Accordingly, to the MTUS, current treatment guidelines recommend this medication is an option for chronic pain using a short course of therapy. The effect of Flexeril is great is the first four days of treatment, suggesting a shorter course as many better. This

medication is not recommended as an addition to other medications. Longer course of Flexeril also are not recommended to be for longer than 2 to 3 weeks as prolonged use me lead to dependence. According to the records, the injured worker has been taking his medication chronically. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity is not necessary.