

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0025968 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 02/18/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 06/17/1998 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 04/03/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 01/07/2015 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 02/11/2015 |

### 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: 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:

The injured worker is a 36 year old, female patient, who sustained an industrial injury on 06/17/1998. The provided documentation showed evidence of an orthopedic, follow up consultation performed on 01/27/2015, reported subjective complaint of ongoing aching and stabbing pain in her upper and mid back region. She complains of aching, burning pain in her low back and also noted pain with numbness to bilateral feet. The patient is prescribed Robaxin and Tylenol # 3; that are noted helping, but the Tylenol # 3 does not offer as good a relief as Norco had in the past. She is not attending any therapy at that time. Subjective findings showed lumbar spine with midline tenderness, spasm and tightness in the paralumbar musculature. Motion is reduced with end range pain noted, with pain radiating to the thoracic spine. Forward flexion is found at 20 degrees, extension is at 8 degrees; and both lateral bending left/right are at 15 degrees with pain and facial grimace. A straight leg raise test is found positive bilaterally with sciatic stretch, notch tenderness. There is also hamstring tightness found. She is diagnosed with cervical spine strain/sprain, chronic; lumbar spine stenosis with bilateral lower extremity radiculopathy and L4-5 disc annular tear with disc protrusion. A request was made for a pain management consultation, Acetaminophen # 3, Naproxen 500 and Robaxin. On 01/07/2015, Utilization Review, non-certified the request, with no citations offered. The injured worker submitted an application for independent medical review of requested services.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Pain management consultation:** 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 Chronic pain programs, early intervention Page(s): 32-33.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, the presence of red flags may indicate the need for specialty consultation. In addition, the requesting physician should provide a documentation supporting the medical necessity for a pain management evaluation with a specialist. The documentation should include the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. In the chronic pain programs, early intervention section of MTUS guidelines stated: "Recommendations for identification of patients that may benefit from early intervention via a multidisciplinary approach: (a) The patient's response to treatment falls outside of the established norms for their specific diagnosis without a physical explanation to explain symptom severity. (b) The patient exhibits excessive pain behavior and/or complaints compared to that expected from the diagnosis. (c) There is a previous medical history of delayed recovery. (d) The patient is not a candidate where surgery or other treatments would clearly be warranted. (e) Inadequate employer support. (f) Loss of employment for greater than 4 weeks. The most discernable indication of at risk status is lost time from work of 4 to 6 weeks. (Mayer 2003)" There is no clear documentation that the patient needs a pain management evaluation as per MTUS criteria. There is no clear documentation that the patient had delayed recovery and a response to medications that falls outside the established norm. The provider did not document the reasons, the specific goals and end point for using the expertise of a specialist. Therefore, the request for Pain Management consultation is not medically necessary.

**Tylenol with Codeine no.3, with two refills:** 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 Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, Tylenol#3 (Tylenol with Codeine) as well as other short acting opioids are indicated for intermittent or breakthrough pain (page 75). It can be used in acute post operative pain. It is not recommended for chronic pain of longterm use as prescribed in this case. 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. 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. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: 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. There is no documentation of reduction of pain and functional improvement with previous use of Tylenol #3. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tylenol #3. Therefore, the prescription of Tylenol with Codeine #3 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.

**Robaxin 750 mg # 60 with two refills:** 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 Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, Robaxin, 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 spasm and pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case does not have clear recent evidence of spasm or that she was experiencing an acute exacerbation of pain. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy of previous use of Robaxin (the patient had been prescribed Robaxin on an ongoing basis for long time). The request for Robaxin 750mg #60 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.