

Case Number:	CM14-0144381		
Date Assigned:	09/12/2014	Date of Injury:	06/13/1997
Decision Date:	10/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/18/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/05/2014

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 and 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 is a patient with a date of injury of 6/13/97. A utilization review determination dated 8/18/14 recommends non-certification of methadone and Skelaxin. It referenced an 8/7/14 medical report identifying increased pain and poor sleep. Pain is 5-6/10 with medication and 10/10 without. Skelaxin was helpful for spasm. On exam, there is decreased ROM and strength with tenderness in the cervical and lumbar regions.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Methadone 10mg #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

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): 76-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for methadone, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that, 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 pain relief noted, but 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 methadone is not medically necessary.

Skelaxin 800mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non-sedating muscle relaxants. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG (Official Disability Guidelines)

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.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Skelaxin, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of non-sedating 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 the CA MTUS. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Skelaxin is not medically necessary.