

Case Number:	CM15-0039568		
Date Assigned:	03/09/2015	Date of Injury:	09/16/1991
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/31/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/02/2015

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 72 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 9/16/1991. He reports hurting his back, right knee and left shoulder. The mechanism of injury was not provided for review. Diagnoses include lumbosacral myofascial sprain/strain, multi-level lumbosacral degenerative disc disease, left shoulder bursitis and right knee bursitis. Treatments to date include physical therapy, home exercise program, injections and medication management. A progress note from the treating provider dated 1/15/2015 indicates the injured worker reported right knee, left shoulder and lower back pain.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Prescription of MSContin 15mg, #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Morphine Sulfate Criteria for the use of Opioids.

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, 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. 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 clear documentation of patient improvement in level of function and quality of life with previous use of narcotics. The patient continues to have chronic pain despite the continuous use of narcotics. The patient has been taking Ms Contin for a longtime without any substantial pain relief or functional benefits. Therefore, the request of MS Contin 15mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Prescription of Ibuprofen 600mg, #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NONSELECTIVE NSAIDS Page(s): 107.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines chapter, NONSELECTIVE NSAIDS section, Ibuprofen is indicated for pain management of breakthrough of neck or back pain. The medication should be used at the lowest dose and for a short period of time. There is no documentation that the patient developed exacerbation of his pain. There is no documentation that the lowest dose and shortest period is used for this patient. Although the patient developed a chronic back pain that may require Ibuprofen, there is no documentation that the provider recommended the lowest dose of Ibuprofen for the shortest period of time. Therefore, the prescription of Ibuprofen 600 mg 90 is not medically necessary.

Unknown prescription of Zanaflex: 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.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, 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 lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case developed continuous pain,

does not have clear exacerbation of back pain and spasm and the prolonged use of Zanaflex is not justified. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence of chronic myofascial pain and spasm. Therefore, the request for Zanaflex is not medically necessary.