

Case Number:	CM15-0121988		
Date Assigned:	07/06/2015	Date of Injury:	08/11/2012
Decision Date:	09/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/24/2015

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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:

The injured worker is a 40-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/11/2012. She reported a popping like sensation in her back while picking up luggage while on a business trip. The injured worker was diagnosed as having status post L5-S1 anterior and posterior fusion with excellent progression of fusion, left foot neuropathic pain improving slowly post-operatively, neuropathic pain left lower extremity and status post prior left L5-S1 discectomy in 2012. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, lumbar spinal surgery in 2012 and 7/2014, epidural injections, unspecified physical therapy, chiropractic, and medications. Currently, the injured worker complains of residual back pain and left foot pain. Pain was rated 5/10, noting medications to include Norco, Tramadol, Tizanidine, Cymbalta, and Remeron. The treatment plan included additional water therapy (2x6) for the lumbar spine, to reduce pain and improve range of motion, and medications. Norco was ordered for severe pain, noting gradual weaning. Tizanidine was ordered for muscle spasms. The use of muscle relaxants was noted for greater than one year. Colace and Miralax were ordered for constipation, and Celebrex was also ordered.

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.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute and Chronic), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Opioids, Pain.

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck and low back pain "except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that "ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. As such, the request for Norco is not medically necessary.

Colace 100mg #90 with 3 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/427442_5.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 77. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Opioid-induced constipation treatment.

Decision rationale: Opioids can commonly cause constipation and treatment to prevent constipation is recommended. ODG states that first line treatment should include "physical activity, appropriate hydration by drinking enough water, and advising the patient to follow a proper diet, rich in fiber" and "some laxatives may help to stimulate gastric motility. Other over-the-counter medications can help loosen otherwise hard stools, add bulk, and increase water content of the stool". Up-to-date states "Patients who respond poorly to fiber, or who do not tolerate it, may require laxatives other than bulk forming agents." Additionally, "There is little evidence to support the use of surfactant agents in chronic constipation. Stool softeners such as docusate sodium (eg, Colace) are intended to lower the surface tension of stool, thereby allowing water to more easily enter the stool. Although these agents have few side effects, they are less effective than other laxatives". The treating physician did document that he encouraged the patient "drink 8 tall glasses of water daily and exercise as tolerated" and "consume a high fiber diet". However, the treating physician did not report how compliant the patient was to the first line constipation treatment and did not indicate if fiber treatment was initiated. Additionally, no

quantitative or qualitative description of bowel movement frequency/difficulty was provided either pre or post "constipation treatment education" by the physician, which is important to understand if first line constipation treatment was successful. As such, the request is not medically necessary at this time.

Miralax solution #3 with 3 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation rxlist.com; http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/427442_5.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Opioid-induced constipation treatment.

Decision rationale: Opioids can commonly cause constipation and treatment to prevent constipation is recommended. ODG states that first line treatment should include "physical activity, appropriate hydration by drinking enough water, and advising the patient to follow a proper diet, rich in fiber" and "some laxatives may help to stimulate gastric motility. Other over-the-counter medications can help loosen otherwise hard stools, add bulk, and increase water content of the stool". Up-to-date states "Patients who respond poorly to fiber, or who do not tolerate it, may require laxatives other than bulk forming agents." Additionally, "There is little evidence to support the use of surfactant agents in chronic constipation. Stool softeners such as docusate sodium (eg, Colace) are intended to lower the surface tension of stool, thereby allowing water to more easily enter the stool. Although these agents have few side effects, they are less effective than other laxatives". The treating physician did document that he encouraged the patient "drink 8 tall glasses of water daily and exercise as tolerated" and "consume a high fiber diet". However, the treating physician did not report how compliant the patient was to the first line constipation treatment and did not indicate if fiber treatment was initiated. Additionally, no quantitative or qualitative description of bowel movement frequency/difficulty was provided either pre or post "constipation treatment education" by the physician, which is important to understand if first line constipation treatment was successful. As such, the request is not medically necessary at this time.

Tizanidine 4mg #60 with 3 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tizanidine Page(s): 63-67.

Decision rationale: Zanaflex is the brand name version of tizanidine, which is a muscle relaxant. MTUS states concerning muscle relaxants "Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (VanTulder, 1998) (Van Tulder, 2003) (Van

Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) 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. In addition, there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. These drugs should be used with caution in patients driving motor vehicles or operating heavy machinery. Drugs with the most limited published evidence in terms of clinical effectiveness include chlorzoxazone, methocarbamol, dantrolene and baclofen. (Chou, 2004) According to a recent review in American Family Physician, skeletal muscle relaxants are the most widely prescribed drug class for musculoskeletal conditions (18.5% of prescriptions), and the most commonly prescribed antispasmodic agents are carisoprodol, Cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, and methocarbamol, but despite their popularity, skeletal muscle relaxants should not be the primary drug class of choice for musculoskeletal conditions. (See2, 2008)" MTUS further states, "Tizanidine (Zanaflex, generic available) is a centrally acting alpha2-adrenergic agonist that is FDA approved for management of spasticity; unlabeled use for low back pain. (Malanga, 2008) Eight studies have demonstrated efficacy for low back pain. (Chou, 2007) One study (conducted only in females) demonstrated a significant decrease in pain associated with chronic myofascial pain syndrome and the authors recommended its use as a first line option to treat myofascial pain. (Malanga, 2002) May also provide benefit as an adjunct treatment for fibromyalgia. (ICSI, 2007)" Refills are not appropriate for Zanaflex due to the need for medical monitoring. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Celebrex 200mg #30 with 3 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-inflammatories, Celebrex, NSAIDs Page(s): 22, 30, 70. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatory medications are the traditional first line treatment for pain, but COX-2 inhibitors (Celebrex) should be considered if the patient has risk of GI complications, according to MTUS. The medical documentation provided does not indicate a reason for the patient to be considered high risk for GI complications. Risk factors for GI bleeding according to ODG include: (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 or multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Additionally, the medical records do not indicate that he is undergoing treatment for any of the FDA approved uses such as osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile rheumatoid arthritis in patients 2 years and older, ankylosing spondylitis, acute pain, and primary dysmenorrhea. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Additional water therapy lumbar spine 2x6: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aqua therapy, physical medicine Page(s): 22, 98-99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Aquatic Therapy.

Decision rationale: California MTUS guidelines state, "Aquatic therapy (including swimming) can minimize the effects of gravity, so it is specifically recommended where reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity." MD Guidelines similarly states, "If the patient has sub acute or chronic LBP and meets criteria for a referral for supervised exercise therapy and has co-morbidities (e.g., extreme obesity, significant degenerative joint disease, etc.) that preclude effective participation in a weight-bearing physical activity, then a trial of aquatic therapy is recommended for the treatment of sub acute or chronic LBP". Regarding the number of visits, MTUS states "Allow for fading of treatment frequency (from up to 3 visits per week to 1 or less), plus active self-directed home Physical Medicine." ODG states "Patients should be formally assessed after a "six-visit clinical trial" to see if the patient is moving in a positive direction, no direction, or a negative direction (prior to continuing with the physical therapy); & (6) When treatment duration and/or number of visits exceeds the guideline, exceptional factors should be noted." At the conclusion of this trial, additional treatment would be assessed based upon documented objective, functional improvement, and appropriate goals for the additional treatment. The medical documents provided do not indicate any concerns that patient was extremely obese. Additionally, the medical records do not indicate that objective findings of functional improvement from the initial trial of aquatic therapy, which is needed to extend and continue additional therapy. As such, the request is not medically necessary at this time.