

Case Number:	CM14-0114840		
Date Assigned:	08/04/2014	Date of Injury:	11/28/2007
Decision Date:	10/23/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/01/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/22/2014

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, has a subspecialty in Pain Management, 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 is a patient with a date of injury of 11/28/07. A utilization review determination dated 7/1/14 recommends non-certification of Prilosec and Fexmid. Anaprox and Ultram ER were certified and Norco was modified from #120 to #110. 6/16/14 medical report identifies up to 70% pain relief with spinal cord stimulator for low back and radicular pain. She has been able to cut back on Norco from 6 to 3 per day. She still requires her muscle relaxant which she uses on occasion, especially at night since she does experience myospasms across the low back. She feels that the combination of medications enable her to function on a daily basis. On exam, there is tenderness, limited ROM with pain, weakness with dorsiflexion on the right, SLR significantly positive on the right, and sensation decreased in the posterolateral thigh and calf on the right. Recommendations include Norco, Ultram ER, Anaprox, Fexmid, Prilosec, Ambien, and Zanaflex.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #120: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it 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, pain relief of 70% was noted, although it was attributed to the recent spinal cord stimulator implantation. There is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement), 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 Norco is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg BID PRN #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 68-69 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for 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 Prilosec is not medically necessary.

FexMid 7.5mg #60: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Fexmid, 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. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of specific objective functional improvement as a result of the medication. 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 Fexmid is not medically necessary.

Ultram ER 150mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): Page 83.

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultram ER, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it 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, pain relief of 70% was noted, although it was attributed to the recent spinal cord stimulator implantation. There is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement), 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 Ultram ER is not medically necessary.