

Case Number:	CM14-0004423		
Date Assigned:	02/05/2014	Date of Injury:	02/11/2009
Decision Date:	12/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	01/06/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/13/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 2/11/09. A utilization review determination dated 1/7/14 recommends non-certification of cyclobenzaprine, ondansetron, omeprazole, and Medrox. 5/1/13 medical report identifies low back pain radiating into BLE with foot drop on the left. On exam, there is tenderness, weakness, spasm, and SLR on the left. Medication refills were recommended.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

ONDANSETRON ODT 8MG #30 X2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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 Chapter, Antiemetics

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for ondansetron, California MTUS guidelines do not contain criteria regarding the use of antiemetic medication. ODG states that antiemetics are not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Guidelines go on to recommend that ondansetron is approved for postoperative use, nausea and vomiting secondary

to chemotherapy, and acute use for gastroenteritis. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has nausea as a result of any of these diagnoses. Additionally, there are no subjective complaints of nausea in any of the recent progress reports provided for review. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested ondansetron is not medically necessary.

OMEPRAZOLE DELAYED-RELEASE 20MG #120: 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 Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for omeprazole (Prilosec), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested omeprazole (Prilosec) is not medically necessary.

MEDROX PAIN RELIEF OINTMENT 120GM X2: 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 Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Medrox, CA MTUS states that topical compound medications require guideline support for all components of the compound in order for the compound to be approved. Topical NSAIDs are indicated for "Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. Neuropathic pain: Not recommended as there is no evidence to support use." Capsaicin is "Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." Within the documentation available for review, none of the abovementioned criteria have been documented. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the use of topical medications rather than the FDA-approved oral forms for this patient. In light of the above issues, the requested Medrox is not medically necessary.

CIDAFLEX #120: 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 Page(s): 50.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for CIDAFLEX, CA MTUS states that glucosamine/chondroitin is recommended as an option given its low risk, in patients with moderate arthritis pain, especially for knee osteoarthritis. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication of subjective/objective/imaging findings consistent with osteoarthritis for which the use of glucosamine/chondroitin would be supported by the CA MTUS. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested CIDAFLEX is not medically necessary.