

Case Number:	CM14-0139323		
Date Assigned:	09/05/2014	Date of Injury:	04/19/2012
Decision Date:	11/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/01/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/28/2014

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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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:

The patient is a 57 year old man who sustained a work related injury on January 4 2008. Subsequently, she developed a chronic back pain and was diagnosed with lumbar sprain and lumbosacral neuritis. The patient was treated with trigger point injections with some efficacy. His physical examination demonstrated lumbar tenderness with reduced range of motion and positive straight leg raising. There is a reduced sensation in the territory of L5 bilaterally. The patient was diagnosed with lumbar radiculopathy, epicondylitis and radial nerve injury. The provider requested authorization for the medications mentioned below.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Omeprazole Dr 20 mg #30 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: My rationale for why the requested treatment/service is or is not medically necessary: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal

events are: (1) age greater than 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAID to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient has GI issue that requires the use of Prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that he is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, Omeprazole 20 mg, #30 with 2 refills prescription is not medically necessary.

Norco 10-325 mg #60 with 2 refills: 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): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. 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. 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. According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10-325 mg #60 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.

Tramadol Hcl 50 mg #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol
Page(s): 113.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram (Tramadol) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. 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. 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. Although, Tramadol may be needed to help with the patient pain, there is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement from its previous use. There is no objective documentation of pain severity level to justify the use of Tramadol with Norco in this patient. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tramadol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medications. Therefore, the prescription of Tramadol Hcl 50 mg #60 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.

Orphenadrine ER 100 mg #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines ANTISPASTICITY DRUGS Page(s): 66.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guideline, Orphenadrine (Norflex, Banflex, Antiflex, Mio-Rel, Orphenate, generic) is a muscle relaxant with anticholinergic effects. MTUS guidelines stated that non-sedating muscle relaxants are 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 does not have clear and recent evidence of acute exacerbation of spasm. The request of Orphenadrine ER 100 mg is not medically necessary.