

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0126722		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/13/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/20/2005
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/06/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/05/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/30/2015

### 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  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 injured worker is a 55 year old male who reported an industrial injury on 6/20/2005. His diagnoses, and or impression, were noted to include: discogenic lumbar condition, status-post 2 lumbar surgeries; and radiculopathy. No current imaging studies were noted. His treatments were noted to include diagnostic studies; injection therapy; lumbar surgery (2010 & 2012); medication management with a signed narcotic agreement and toxicology screenings; and rest from work. The progress notes of 2/18/2015 reported a follow-up evaluation for complaints which included radiating low back pain, into the right leg. Objective findings were noted to include: decreased right toe dorsiflexion and knee flexion; non-reactive bilateral lower extremity reflexes; hyper-sensation to the right lower extremity; an antalgic gait; and notation that he would be tapered off Oxycodone and only take Norco for pain. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include the Norco and Cyclobenzaprine.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325 MG #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) 74-96.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Guidelines cite opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing results or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury of 2005 without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Norco 10/325 MG #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 MG #60:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants, pg 128.

**Decision rationale:** Guidelines do not recommend long-term use of this muscle relaxant for this chronic injury of 2005. Additionally, the efficacy in clinical trials has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication or medical need for this treatment and there is no report of significant progressive deteriorating clinical findings, acute flare-up or new injury to support for its long-term use. There is no report of functional improvement resulting from its previous treatment to support further use as the patient remains unchanged. The Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 MG #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.