

Case Number:	CM15-0239983		
Date Assigned:	12/17/2015	Date of Injury:	05/17/1987
Decision Date:	01/22/2016	UR Denial Date:	11/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/08/2015

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 75 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 5-17-1987. Medical records indicate the worker is undergoing treatment for lumbar radiculopathy, low back pain, lumbar degenerative disc disease, lumbar post spine fusion and post spinal cord stimulator implant. A recent progress report dated 8-20-2015, reported the injured worker complained of low back pain radiating to the bilateral lower extremities, rated 4 out of 10 with medications and 8 out of 10 without medications. Physical examination revealed lumbar tenderness to palpation, normal sensation and deep tendon reflexes are 1+. Treatment to date has included surgery, spinal cord stimulator, physical therapy, Zanaflex (since at least 5-28-2015), MS Contin (since at least 5-28-2015) and Norco (since at least 5-28-2015). The physician is requesting Zanaflex 2mg #120 with 2 refills and Norco 10-325mg #120 with 2 refills and Norco 10-325mg #120 with 2 refills. On 11-5-2015 the Utilization Review noncertified the request for Zanaflex 2mg #120 with 2 refills and Norco 10-325mg #120 with 2 refills and modified the request for Norco 10-325mg #120 with 2 refills.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Zanaflex 2mg #120 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain (Chronic): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain but rather ongoing back pain, this is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

MS Contin 30mg #120 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain, Opioid hyperalgesia.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state: When to Continue Opioids: (a) if the patient has returned to work, or (b) if the patient has improved functioning and pain (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004). The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is documented significant decrease in objective pain measures such as VAS scores for significant periods of time with pain decreased to a 4/10 from an 8/10. There are no objective measures of improvement of function or how the medication improves activities. Therefore all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #120 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, dosing, Weaning of Medications.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state: When to Continue Opioids: (a) if the patient has returned to work, or (b) if the patient has improved functioning and pain (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004). The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is documented significant decrease in objective pain measures such as VAS scores for significant periods of time with pain decreased to a 4/10 from an 8/10. There are no objective measures of improvement of function or how the medication improves activities. Therefore all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.