

Case Number:	CM14-0174288		
Date Assigned:	10/24/2014	Date of Injury:	05/01/1996
Decision Date:	12/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/30/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/20/2014

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 Texas & 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 50 year old male patient who sustained a work related injury on 05/01/1996. The exact mechanism of injury was not specified in the records provided. The current diagnoses include sprain, cervical; degeneration cervical disc; fixation, knee; epicondylitis medial elbow; disc protrusion; spinal stenosis, lumbar; chondromalacia, knee and fracture, malleolus (closed). Per the doctor's note dated 7/30/2014, patient has complaints of constant slight to intermittent moderate and severe neck pain radiating down upper extremities to hands with numbness and tingling, stiffness and tightness of neck; frequent headaches; constant slight to intermittent moderate and occasionally severe low back pain radiating down lower extremities to feet with numbness and tingling, stiffness, tightness and constant moderate occasionally severe knee pain left greater than right increased with squatting, kneeling or stair use with popping, and constant moderate and occasionally severe left ankle pain radiating to left calf. Physical examination revealed limited motion of low back, swelling of right knee, limited motion of left ankle with occasional popping, clicking and swelling, lumbar ROM: flexion 45 degrees; extension 10 degrees, lateral flexion 20 degrees; negative straight leg raise; extensor hallucis longus and dorsiflexion 5-/5 and left L5 reduced sensation. The current medication lists include Protonix, Omeprazole, Carisoprodol and Norco. Diagnostic imaging reports were not specified in the records provided. Any surgical or procedure note related to this injury were not specified in the records provided. Other therapy done for this injury was not specified in the records provided.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hydrocodone/APAP 10/325mg #60 with unknown refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines CRITERIA FOR USE OF OPIOIDS, Therapeutic Trial of Opioids Page(s): 76-80.

Decision rationale: Norco contains Hydrocodone with APAP which is an opioid analgesic in combination with acetaminophen. According to CA MTUS guidelines cited below, "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." The records provided do not specify that patient has set goals regarding the use of opioid analgesic. A treatment failure with non-opioid analgesics is not specified in the records provided. Other criteria for ongoing management of opioids are: "The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. Continued review of the overall situation in regards to non-opioid means of pain control. Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Consider the use of a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs." The records provided do not provide a documentation of response in regards to pain control and functional improvement to opioid analgesic for this patient. The continued review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control is not documented in the records provided. As recommended by MTUS a documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects should be maintained for ongoing management of opioid analgesic, these are not specified in the records provided. MTUS guidelines also recommend urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs in patients using opioids for long term. A recent urine drug screen report is not specified in the records provided. Whether improvement in pain translated into objective functional improvement including ability to work is not specified in the records provided with this, it is deemed that, this patient does not meet criteria for ongoing continued use of opioids analgesic. The medical necessity of Hydrocodone/APAP 10/325mg #60 with unknown refills is not medically necessary.

Carisoprodol 350mg #60 with unknown refills: 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 Carisoprodol (Soma), and Muscle relaxants Page(s): 29, 63.

Decision rationale: According to California MTUS, Chronic pain medical treatment guidelines, Carisoprodol (Soma) is a muscle relaxant and it is not recommended for chronic pain. Per the guidelines, "Carisoprodol is not indicated for long-term use. It has been suggested that the main effect is due to generalized sedation and treatment of anxiety." California MTUS, Chronic pain medical treatment 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. Per the guideline, "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. Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. Any evidence of spasticity and muscle spasm related to multiple sclerosis and spinal cord injuries was not specified in the records provided. California MTUS, Chronic pain medical treatment 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. Soma is recommended for short term use only, in acute exacerbations in chronic pain. Patient had a chronic injury and any evidence of acute exacerbations in pain and muscle spasm was not specified in the records provided. The date of injury for this patient is 05/1/96. As the patient does not have any acute pain at this time, the use of muscle relaxants is not supported by the CA MTUS chronic pain guidelines. Furthermore as per guidelines, skeletal muscle relaxants show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Therefore the medical necessity of Carisoprodol 350mg #60 with unknown refills is not medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS NSAIDs guidelines cited below, regarding use of proton pump inhibitors with NSAIDs, the MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines recommend PPIs in, "Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events, patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events, treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy." Per the cited guidelines, patient is considered at high risk for gastrointestinal events with the use of NSAIDs when- "(1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." There is no evidence in the records provided that the patient has GI symptoms with the use of NSAIDs. Any current use of NSAIDs is not specified in the records provided. The records provided do not specify any objective evidence of GI disorders, GI bleeding or peptic ulcer. Request for Omeprazole 20mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Protonix 20mg #60 and unknown refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS NSAIDs guidelines cited below, regarding use of proton pump inhibitors with NSAIDs, the MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines recommend PPIs in, "Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events, patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events, treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy." Per the cited guidelines, patient is considered at high risk for gastrointestinal events with the use of NSAIDs when- "(1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." There is no evidence in the records provided that the patient has GI symptoms with the use of NSAIDs. Any current use of NSAIDs is not specified in the records provided. The records provided do not specify any objective evidence of GI disorders, GI bleeding or peptic ulcer. The request for Protonix 20mg #60 and unknown refills is not medically necessary.