

Case Number:	CM14-0214663		
Date Assigned:	01/07/2015	Date of Injury:	09/22/1986
Decision Date:	02/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/25/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/22/2014

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. 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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

██████████ is a 53-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on September 22, 1986. Subsequently, she developed chronic back pain. A progress report dated October 31, 2014 documented that the patient complained of chronic pain of the lumbar spine. On physical examination, there was spasm and tenderness in the paravertebral musculature of the lumbar spine with decreased range of motion on flexion and extension. The patient had difficulty standing up from the examining chair. According to a progress report dated December 12, 2014, the patient continued to complain of left shoulder pain with decreased range of motion and strength, as well as neck and back pain radiating into the upper and lower extremities with pain, paresthesias, and numbness. The patient was diagnosed with sprain/strain of neck, thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis, shoulder bursae and tendon disorders, pes Anserinus Tendinitis or Bursitis, pain in limb, sprain/strain of lumbar region, and shoulder region disorders.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

60 Norflex 100mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines ANTISPASTICITY DRUGS Page(s): 66.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guideline, Orphenadrine (Norflex , Banflex , Antiflex, Mio-Rel, Orphenate, generic) is a muscle relaxant with anticholinergic effects. MUTUS guidelines stated that a non-sedating muscle relaxants is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case does not have clear and recent evidence of acute exacerbation of spasm.

60 Prilosec 20mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events . The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient has GI issue that requires the use of prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events.

30 Ultram ER 150mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 113.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram (Tramadol) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules:(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. Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) 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. Although, Tramadol may be needed to help with the patient pain, there is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement from its previous use. The patient stated he has minimal relief with her medications. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tramadol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with her medications.