

Case Number:	CM14-0176392		
Date Assigned:	10/29/2014	Date of Injury:	05/18/2012
Decision Date:	12/11/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/07/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/24/2014

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 North Carolina. 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 49-year-old with a reported date of injury of 01/17/2012. The patient has the diagnoses of cervical strain, lumbar strain, herniated cervical and lumbar disc, status post total knee arthroplasty, sprain/stain of the left knee, back strain with herniated thoracic disc, right wrist and hand pain with carpal tunnel syndrome, left wrist and hand pain with carpal tunnel syndrome and anxiety/depression. Per the most recent progress notes provided for review from the primary treating physician dated 08/15/2014, the patient had complaints of neck pain and stiffness. The physical exam noted tenderness with spasm in the cervical spine, positive cervical compression and shoulder depression test and decreased range of motion. Treatment plan recommendations included cervical spine epidural injections, blood work, acupuncture and continuation of medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective for DOS 7/11/14: Flexeril 7.5MG, #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) 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. (Homik, 2004) The long term chronic use of this medication is not recommended per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the acute flare up of chronic low back pain. The specific use of this medication for greater than 3 weeks is not recommended per the California MTUS. The criteria set forth above for its use has not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective for DOS 7/11/14: Prilosec 20mg, #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID
Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID use and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 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 NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. Recommendations Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g, ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.) Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease: (1) A non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg omeprazole daily) or misoprostol (200 g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. There is no supplied documentation that places this patient at intermediate or severe gastrointestinal risk that would require a use of a PPI with NSAID therapy. For these reasons the criteria as set forth above have not been met for the use of the medication. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective for DOS 7/11/14: Tramadol 150mg, #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids
Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (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. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: 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 for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to no opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids (a) If the patient has returned to work (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox- AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication is not recommended unless certain objective outcome measures have been met as defined above. There is no provided objective outcome measure that shows significant improvement in function while on the medication. There is no documentation of significant improvement in VAS scores while on the medication. The patient's work status is not mentioned. For these reasons criteria for ongoing and continued use of the medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective for DOS 7/11/14: Naproxen 550mg, #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID Page(s): 71-73.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guideline section on NSAID therapy states: Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxen being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) Naproxen (Naprosyn): delayed release (EC-Naprosyn), as Sodium salt (Anaprox, Anaprox DS, Aleve [otc]) Generic available; extended-release (Naprelan): 375 mg. Different dose strengths and formulations of the drug are not necessarily bioequivalent. Dosing Information: Osteoarthritis or ankylosing spondylitis: Dividing the daily dose into 3 doses versus 2 doses for immediate-release and delayed-release formulations generally does not affect response. Morning and evening doses do not have to be equal in size. The dose may be increased to 1500 mg/day of naproxen for limited periods when a higher level of analgesic/anti-inflammatory activity is required (for up to 6 months). This medication is recommended at the lowest possible dose for the shortest period of time. The duration of "shortest period of time" is not defined in the California MTUS. The dose prescribed however is in excess of the highest recommended dose for this NSAID Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective for DOS 7/11/14: Xanax 7.5mg, #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines anxiolytics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines benzodiazepines Page(s): 24.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on benzodiazepines states: Benzodiazepines Not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic, anxiolytic, anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant. 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. Tolerance to anticonvulsant and muscle relaxant effects occurs within weeks. (Baillargeon, 2003) (Ashton, 2005) This patient has the diagnoses of anxiety however the long term chronic use of benzodiazepines in the treatment of anxiety is not recommended per the

California MTUS. There is no documentation of failure of first line anxiety treatment agents. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.