

Case Number:	CM15-0092033		
Date Assigned:	05/18/2015	Date of Injury:	11/01/2010
Decision Date:	06/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/13/2015

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:

The injured worker is a 56 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/1/10. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical strain, lumbar sprain/strain, possible disc syndrome, lumbago and bilateral sciatica with neuralgia. Treatment to date has included oral medications, chiropractic treatment, home exercise program and oral medications including opioids. Currently, the injured worker complains of neck and back pain with weakness, numbness and tingling radiating to lower extremities with an unstable gait and insomnia. He rates pain as 5/10 with medications and 9/10 without medications. Physical exam noted left leg limp, decreased range of motion of cervical spine with tenderness noted in cervical and trapezius muscle groups bilaterally with muscle guarding and tenderness is noted in the lumbar paraspinal muscles and muscle guarding with significantly limited range of motion. A request for authorization was submitted for a bone scan, lactulose, oxycodone, gabapentin, methocarbamol, Butrans and Opana.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Methocarbamol 750mg, #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for Pain).

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. 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 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 Methocarbamol 750mg, #90 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Butrans 20mg, #14: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Buprenorphine HCL, pages 26-27.

Decision rationale: Submitted reports have not demonstrated the indication or medical necessity for this medication request. Per MTUS Chronic Pain, Butrans or Buprenorphine is a scheduled III controlled substance recommended for treatment of opiate addiction or opiate agonist dependence. Request has been reviewed previously and non-certified for rationale of lack of pain contract, indication, and documentation of opioid addiction. Buprenorphine has one of the most high profile side effects of a scheduled III medication. Per the Guidelines, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial and use should be reserved for those with improved attributable functional outcomes. This is not apparent here as this patient reports no change in pain relief, no functional improvement in daily activities, and has not decreased in medical utilization or self-independence continuing to treat for chronic pain symptoms. There is also no notation of any functional improvement while on the patch nor is there any recent urine drug screening results in accordance to pain contract needed in this case. Without sufficient monitoring of narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance for this individual along with no weaning process attempted for this chronic injury. Medical necessity for continued treatment has not been established for Buprenorphine. The Butrans 20mg, #14 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Opana 40mg, #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, 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 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 without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Opana 40mg, #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.