

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0111229		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/01/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/28/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/19/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/16/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/16/2014

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This patient sustained an injury on 7/28/10 while employed by [REDACTED]. Request(s) under consideration include Diclofenac sodium and Tramadol/APAP 37.5mg #90. Diagnoses include lumbosacral spondylosis/ sprain/ strain. AME report of 2/13/13 noted the patient with ongoing chronic low back pain. Medications list Tramadol, Flexeril, and anti-inflammatory. Conservative care has included acupuncture, massage, therapy, medications, and modified activity/rest; however, only provided temporary relief. Report of 5/28/14 from the provider noted the patient with ongoing low back pain rated at 6/10 without medications as use is intermittent for flare-ups. Current medications list Diclofenac Sodium, Cyclobenzaprine, Tramadol/APAP, Tylenol, Lotensin, and Norvasc. The patient was starting acupuncture and is working full time. The request(s) for Diclofenac sodium was non-certified and Tramadol/APAP 37.5mg #90 was modified for #60 on 6/16/14 citing guidelines criteria and lack of medical necessity.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Diclofenac sodium:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines-Treatment for Worker's Compensation PainDiclofenac sodium.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 22.

**Decision rationale:** Anti-inflammatories are the traditional first line of treatment, to reduce pain so activity and functional restoration can resume, but long-term use may not be warranted. Monitoring of NSAID's functional benefit is advised as per Guidelines, long-term use of NSAIDS beyond a few weeks may actually retard muscle and connective tissue healing and increase the risk of hip fractures. Available reports submitted have not adequately addressed the indication to continue a NSAID for a chronic injury nor have they demonstrated any functional efficacy derived from treatment already rendered. The Diclofenac sodium is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Tramadol/APAP 37.5mg #90:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, chronic pain.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96.

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities or decreased in medical utilization. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain. The Tramadol/APAP 37.5mg #90 is not medically necessary and appropriate.