

Case Number:	CM15-0091758		
Date Assigned:	05/18/2015	Date of Injury:	05/25/2012
Decision Date:	08/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/12/2015

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: Family Practice

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 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/25/2012. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar spine sprain/strain and cervical spine sprain/strain. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 4/1/2015, the injured worker complains of low back pain radiating down the leg and neck stiffness, soreness with some pain down the arms, rated 10/10. Physical examination showed cervical and lumbar paravertebral tenderness. The treating physician is requesting Norco 10/325 mg #60, Norflex 100 mg #60, Neurontin 600 mg #60 and Voltaren XR 100 mg #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #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): 76-78, 80.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the long-term use of opioids, including Norco. These guidelines have established criteria on the use of opioids for the ongoing management of pain. Actions should include: prescriptions from a single practitioner and from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. There should be an 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. There should be evidence of documentation of the '4 As for Ongoing Monitoring.' These four domains include: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychological functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. Further, there should be consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain that does not improve on opioids in 3 months. There should be consideration of an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse (Pages 76-78). Finally, the guidelines indicate that for chronic pain, the long-term efficacy of opioids is unclear. Failure to respond to a time-limited course of opioids has led to the suggestion of reassessment and consideration of alternative therapy (Page 80). Based on the review of the medical records, there is insufficient documentation in support of these stated MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines for the ongoing use of opioids. There is insufficient documentation of the '4 As for Ongoing Monitoring.' The treatment course of opioids in this patient has extended well beyond the timeframe required for a reassessment of therapy. In summary, there is insufficient documentation to support the chronic use of an opioid in this patient. Treatment with Norco is not considered as medically necessary.

Norflex 100mg #60: 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 For Pain Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the use of muscle relaxants, including Norflex, as a treatment modality. These guidelines recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. 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. Also 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. In this case, the records indicate that Norflex is being used as a long-term treatment strategy for this patient's symptoms. Long-term use is not consistent with the above cited MTUS guidelines. For this reason, Norflex is not considered as medically necessary.

Neurontin 600mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines anti-epilepsy drugs / anti-convulsants.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-19.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the use of antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs), including Neurontin, as a treatment modality. AEDs are primarily used in the treatment of neuropathic pain. When used there must be documentation of appropriate outcomes to justify chronic use. Regarding these outcomes, the MTUS guidelines state the following: Outcome: A "good" response to the use of AEDs has been defined as a 50% reduction in pain and a "moderate" response as a 30% reduction. It has been reported that a 30% reduction in pain is clinically important to patients and a lack of response of this magnitude may be the "trigger" for the following: (1) a switch to a different first-line agent (TCA, SNRI or AED are considered first-line treatment); or (2) combination therapy if treatment with a single drug agent fails. (Eisenberg, 2007) (Jensen, 2006) After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. In this case, despite evidence of long-term use, there is insufficient evidence of a beneficial outcome from the use of Neurontin. Without documentation of benefit, there is no justification for its continued use. Therefore, Neurontin is not considered as medically necessary.

Voltaren XR 100mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the use of NSAIDs, including Voltaren XR, as a treatment modality. In general, the MTUS guidelines state that NSAIDs should be used for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. The specific recommendations are as follows: Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects,

although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. Back Pain - Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another. Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long-term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. In this case, the records indicate that Voltaren XR is being used as a long-term treatment strategy for this patient's symptoms. As noted in the above cited MTUS guidelines, NSAIDs are only recommended for short-term use. There is no evidence in the medical records that the patient is achieving increased mobility/improved function based on the use of Voltaren XR. For this reason, Voltaren XR is not medically necessary.