

Case Number:	CM15-0172052		
Date Assigned:	09/15/2015	Date of Injury:	06/15/2002
Decision Date:	11/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/01/2015

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, 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 49 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on June 15, 2002, incurring neck and low back injuries. She was diagnosed with cervical disc disease and lumbar disc disease with disc herniation. The injured worker continued with back pain radiating down both legs with numbness and tingling causing muscle weakness and impaired balance. She underwent a lumbar spine fusion in 2010 and a cervical spine fusion in 2011. Treatment included diagnostic imaging, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, spinal trigger point injections, pain medications, muscle relaxants, sleep aides, pain management program, and activity restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complained of persistent low back pain. Her medications help decreased her pain by 50% and she becomes more functional with her activities of daily living. Without pain medications, her pain would be unbearable. The injured worker was noted to have restricted and painful range of motion. She was diagnosed with lumbago, cervicogenic headaches and lumbar degenerative disc disease and cervical degenerative disc disease. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization on September 1, 2015, included prescriptions for Soma, MS Contin, Norco and Restoril. On August 14, 2015, utilization review denied the prescriptions for Soma and Restoril and modified the prescriptions for MS Contin from a quantity of #60 to #45 and modified Norco from a quantity of #90 to #30. Notes indicate that the patient is undergoing screening urinalysis. Notes also indicate that the patient will be seeing pain management.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Soma 350mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for carisoprodol (Soma), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that Soma specifically is not recommended for more than 2 to 3 weeks. Within the documentation available for review, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested carisoprodol (Soma) is not medically necessary.

MS Contin 100mg #60: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification), Opioids, California Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) [DWC], Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids for neuropathic pain, Opioids for osteoarthritis, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain, Opioids, dealing with misuse & addiction, Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction, Opioids, dosing, Opioids, indicators for addiction, Opioids, long-term assessment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for MS Contin 100mg #60, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. 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 indication that the medication is improving the patient's function and pain with no intolerable side effects or aberrant use, and the patient is noted to undergo monitoring. Additionally, the patient is noted to be seeing a pain management physician which negates the morphine equivalent dose ceiling of prescribing. In light of the above, the currently requested MS Contin 100mg #60 is medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #90: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification), Opioids, California Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) [DWC], Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids for neuropathic pain, Opioids for osteoarthritis, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain, Opioids, dealing with misuse & addiction, Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction, Opioids, dosing, Opioids, indicators for addiction, Opioids, long-term assessment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. 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 indication that the medication is improving the patient's function and pain with no intolerable side effects or aberrant use, and the patient is noted to undergo monitoring. Additionally, the patient is noted to be seeing a pain management physician which negates the morphine equivalent dose ceiling of prescribing. In light of the above, the currently requested Norco is medically necessary.

Restoril 30mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, Sleep Medication, Insomnia treatment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for temazepam (Restoril), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the benzodiazepines are not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Within the documentation available for review, there is no description of the patient's sleep complaints, failure of behavioral treatment, response to medication, etc. As such, there is no clear indication for use of this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested temazepam (Restoril) is not medically necessary.