

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0011593		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	01/27/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/11/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/24/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	12/18/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/20/2015

### 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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

### 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 33 year old male, who sustained a work related injury on 1/11/10. The diagnoses have included lumbar fusion, residual back pain, depression and anxiety. Treatments to date have included 5 physical therapy sessions, lumbar spine surgery, chiropractic treatments, and use of a cane for ambulation. The injured worker complains of constant low back pain. He notes occasional spasms and swelling of feet. He rates the pain a 3/10. He has tenderness to palpation of low back. He has limited range of motion of lower back. On 12/18/14, Utilization Review non-certified a prescription request for Robaxin 750mg., #60. The California MTUS, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, were cited. On 12/18/14, Utilization Review modified a request for 12 physical therapy sessions to 4 physical therapy sessions. The California MTUS, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**12 sessions of Physical Therapy:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS CPMTG, physical medicine guidelines state: Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine. Myalgia and myositis, unspecified (ICD9 729.1): 9-10 visits over 8 weeks. Neuralgia, neuritis, and radiculitis, unspecified (ICD 729.2): 8-10 visits over 4 weeks."The records submitted for review state that the patient has had at least 5 visits of physical therapy. As the request is for more sessions than the recommended amount, the request is not medically necessary.

**Robaxin 750mg #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 Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS CPMTG recommends non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. 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. As there is no documentation substantiating that the IW is suffering an acute exacerbation (rather, chronic pain without exacerbation is what the documentation conveys) the request is not medically necessary.

**Ultracet 37.5/325mg #60:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's" (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs."Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Ultracet nor any documentation addressing the 4 A's domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain

relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.