

Case Number:	CM14-0154498		
Date Assigned:	09/24/2014	Date of Injury:	09/04/2010
Decision Date:	10/27/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/17/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/22/2014

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 Family 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 44-year-old female who reported an industrial injury on 9/4/2010, over four (4) years ago, attributed to the performance of her usual and customary job tasks as a [REDACTED] officer reported as a trip and fall due to a hole in the pavement. The employer accepted the lower back, soft tissue of the neck, right ankle, and the right hand for this industrial claim. The patient is noted to be permanent and stationary. The patient complained of chronic pain. The objective findings on examination included walked with the aid of a cane; antalgic gait limited by pain on the left; palpable muscle spasm; diminished range of motion to the lumbar spine with tenderness to palpation of the paraspinal muscles; neurological status was normal. The diagnoses included cervicalgia; disorder of bursa and tendons in the shoulder; anxiety syndrome; major depressive disorder; insomnia; sedative or hypnotic dependence. The patient was prescribed Cymbalta 30 mg TID; Norco 10/325 mg TID; cyclobenzaprine 10 mg TID; Xanax 0.5 mg one in a.m. and two at bedtime; Naprosyn 500 mg b.i.d.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/3525mg #1: 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): 74-97. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter-opioids

Decision rationale: The prescription for Hydrocodone-APAP (Norco) 10/325 mg for short acting pain is being prescribed as an opioid analgesic for the treatment of chronic pain to the neck and shoulder for the date of injury four (4) years ago for the reported diagnoses. The objective findings on examination do not support the medical necessity for continued opioid analgesics. The patient is being prescribed opioids for chronic neck/back pain, which is inconsistent with the recommendations of the CA MTUS. There is no objective evidence provided to support the continued prescription of opioid analgesics for the cited diagnoses and effects of the industrial claim. The patient should be titrated down and off the prescribed Hydrocodone. The patient is 4 years s/p DOI with reported continued issues; however, there is no rationale supported with objective evidence to continue the use of opioids. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the continuation of opioids for the effects of the industrial injury. The chronic use of Hydrocodone-APAP/Norco is not recommended by the CA MTUS; the ACOEM Guidelines or the Official Disability Guidelines for the long-term treatment of chronic neck pain. There is no demonstrated sustained functional improvement from the prescribed high dose opioids. The prescription of opiates on a continued long-term basis is inconsistent with the CA MTUS and the Official Disability Guidelines recommendations for the use of opiate medications for the treatment of chronic pain. There is objective evidence that supports the use of opioid analgesics in the treatment of this patient over the use of NSAIDs for the treatment of chronic pain. The current prescription of opioid analgesics is inconsistent with evidence-based guidelines. The prescription of opiates on a continued long-term basis is inconsistent with the Official Disability Guidelines recommendations for the use of opiate medications for the treatment of chronic pain. There is objective evidence that supports the use of opioid analgesics in the treatment of this patient over the use of NSAIDs for the treatment of chronic pain issues. Evidence-based guidelines necessitate documentation that the patient has signed an appropriate pain contract, functional expectations have been agreed to by the clinician, and the patient, pain medications will be provided by one physician only, and the patient agrees to use only those medications recommended or agreed to by the clinician to support the medical necessity of treatment with opioids. The ACOEM Guidelines updated chapter on chronic pain states, "Opiates for the treatment of mechanical and compressive etiologies: rarely beneficial. Chronic pain can have a mixed physiologic etiology of both neuropathic and nociceptive components. In most cases, analgesic treatment should begin with acetaminophen, aspirin, and NSAIDs (as suggested by the WHO step-wise algorithm). When these drugs do not satisfactorily reduce pain, opioids for moderate to moderately severe pain may be added to (not substituted for) the less efficacious drugs. A major concern about the use of opioids for chronic pain is that most randomized controlled trials have been limited to a short-term period (≤ 70 days). This leads to a concern about confounding issues; such as, tolerance, opioid-induced hyperalgesia, long-range adverse effects, such as, hypogonadism and/or opioid abuse, and the influence of placebo as a variable for treatment effect." ACOEM guidelines state that opioids appear to be no more effective than safer analgesics for managing most musculoskeletal symptoms; they should be used only if needed for severe pain and only for a short time. The long-term use of opioid medications may be considered in the treatment of chronic musculoskeletal pain, if: The patient has signed an appropriate pain contract; Functional expectations have been agreed to by the

clinician and the patient; Pain medications will be provided by one physician only; The patient agrees to use only those medications recommended or agreed to by the clinician. ACOEM also notes, "Pain medications are typically not useful in the subacute and chronic phases and have been shown to be the most important factor impeding recovery of function." There is no clinical documentation by with objective findings on examination to support the medical necessity of Hydrocodone-APAP for this long period of time or to support ongoing functional improvement. There is no provided evidence that the patient has received benefit or demonstrated functional improvement with the prescribed Hydrocodone-APAP. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescribed Opioids. The continued prescription for Norco 10/325 mg is not demonstrated to be medically necessary.

Xanax 0.5mg #1: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter-- medications for chronic pain; benzodiazepines

Decision rationale: The continued prescription of Xanax (alprazolam) 0.5 mg is not supported with objective evidence to support medical necessity and is inconsistent with the recommendations of the currently accepted evidence based guidelines. The patient is being prescribed a benzodiazepine for a muscle relaxant and an anxiety agent, which is not recommended by the CA MTUS. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription of Xanax/Alprazolam for this patient in relation to the effects of the industrial injury. The Xanax/Alprazolam is being prescribed for anxiety issues that are not supported with a rationale for a nexus to the cited mechanism of injury or cited diagnoses. The patient was recommended to be discontinued from the prescribed Xanax/Alprazolam by weaning down and off. The anxiety issues are not demonstrated to be industrial and should be treated with alternative methods. The use of a short half-life benzodiazepines, such as, Alprazolam 0.5 mg for anxiety is not medically necessary or supported by evidence-based guidelines. The request for the use of Xanax for anxiety, or as a muscle relaxant is not recommended by the CA MTUS; the ACOEM Guidelines or the Official Disability Guidelines. The ODG states: Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. Tolerance to hypnotic effects develops rapidly. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. The prescription of Xanax/Alprazolam on an industrial basis is not medically necessary and inconsistent with evidence-based guidelines. The current prescription for Xanax/Alprazolam is not demonstrated to be medically necessary or reasonable for the treatment of the effects of the industrial injury. The CA MTUS does not recommend Xanax/Alprazolam as the efficacy is unproven, alternatives are readily available, and Xanax use may lead to dependence. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescribed Alprazolam 0.5 mg.

