MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM14-0070403		
Date Assigned:	07/14/2014	Date of Injury:	05/04/2013
Decision Date:	09/18/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/02/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/15/2014

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 57-year-old male patient who reported an industrial injury on 5/4/2012, over 28 months ago, attributed to the performance of his customary job tasks. The patient was being treated for chronic low back pain with lumbar disc capacity and was noted to be status post bilateral total hip arthroplasty. The patient complained of persistent low back pain. The reported symptoms to the bilateral hips were unchanged. The objective findings on examination included lumbar spine with tenderness to palpation to the mid to distal lumbar segments, pain with terminal motion, positive seated nerve root test; tenderness to palpation to the bilateral hips; residual weakness. The patient was treated with lumbar spine ESI (epidural steroid injection); acupuncture and the prescribed medications. The patient was prescribed Naproxen 550 mg #120; Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 mg #120; Ondansetron 8 mg #60; and Omeprazole 20 mg #120.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Naproxen Sodium 550mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines anti-inflammatory medications Page(s): 67-68. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter medications for chronic pain and NSAIDs.

Decision rationale: The use of Naproxen 550 mg is consistent with the currently accepted guidelines and the general practice of medicine for musculoskeletal strains and injuries; however, there is no evidence of functional improvement or benefit from this NSAID. There is no evidence that OTC NSAIDs would not be appropriate for similar use for this patient. The prescription of Naproxen is not supported with appropriate objective evidence as opposed to the NSAIDs available OTC. The prescription of Naproxen should be discontinued in favor of OTC NSAIDs. There is no provided evidence that the available OTC NSAIDs were ineffective for the treatment of inflammation. There is no documented functional improvement with the use of the prescribed Naproxen. The prescription for Naproxen 550 mg #120 is not demonstrated to be medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines anti-inflammatory medication Page(s): 67-68. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter-medications for chronic pain; NSAIDs.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines section on anti-inflammatory medications and gastrointestional symptoms states; "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestional events." The medical records provided for review do not provide additional details in regards to the above assessment needed for this request. No indication or rationale for gastrointestional prophylaxis is documented in the records provided. There are no demonstrated or documented GI issues attributed to NSAIDs for this patient. The patient was prescribed Omeprazole routine for prophylaxis with Naproxen. The protection of the gastric lining from the chemical effects of NSAIDs is appropriately accomplished with the use of the proton pump inhibitors such as Omeprazole. The patient is not documented to be taking NSAIDs. There is no industrial indication for the use of Omeprazole due to "stomach issues" or stomach irritation. The proton pump inhibitors provide protection from medication side effects of dyspepsia or stomach discomfort brought on by NSAIDs. The use of Omeprazole is medically necessary if the patient were prescribed conventional NSAIDs and complained of GI issues associated with NSAIDs. Whereas 50% of patient taking NSAIDs may complain of GI upset, it is not clear that the patient was prescribed Omeprazole automatically. The prescribed opioid analgesic, not an NSAID, was accompanied by a prescription for Omeprazole without documentation of complications. There were no documented GI effects of the NSAIDs to the stomach of the patient and the Omeprazole was dispensed or prescribed routinely. There is no documented functional improvement with the prescribed Omeprazole. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription for Omeprazole 20 mg #120.

Ondansetron 8mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG)-TWC Pain Procedure Summary last updated 04/10/2014.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence:General disciplinary guidelines for the practice of medicine.

Decision rationale: The treating provider provided no objective evidence to support the medical necessity of the prescribed Zofran/Ondansetron for nausea or vomiting. The prescription of Ondansetron for episodes of nausea and vomiting allegedly due to the side effects of medications is not supported with objective evidence. Zofran is typically prescribed for the nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy and is not medically necessary for nausea suggested to be caused by medication side effects prescribed for the course of treatment. There is no documentation of any medications caused such side effects or the use of typical generic medications generally prescribed for nausea or vomiting. The prescription was provided without objective evidence of medication side effects or any relation to the effects of the industrial injury. There is no documentation of the failure of more common anti-emetics. The prescription of Zofran is recommended only for the nausea and vomiting associated with chemotherapy and is not FDA approved for the use of general nausea secondary to medications or from SCS use. The use of the Zofran for the effects of the industrial injury is not supported with objective evidence that demonstrates medical necessity over conventionally prescribed anti-emetics. The patient is being prescribed Ondansetron for an off label purpose and does not meet the criteria recommended for the use of the anti-nausea medications developed for chemotherapy side effects. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescribed Ondansetron 8 mg #60. Zofran: (Ondansetron) is a serotonin 5-HT3 receptor antagonist used mainly as an antiemetic to treat nausea and vomiting, often following chemotherapy. Its effects are thought to be on both peripheral and central nerves. Ondansetron reduces the activity of the vagus nerve, which deactivates the vomiting center in the medulla oblongata, and also blocks serotonin receptors in the chemoreceptor trigger zone. It has little effect on vomiting caused by motion sickness, and does not have any effect on dopamine receptors or muscarinic receptors. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine 7 .5mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG-TWC Pain Procedure Summary last updated 04/10/2014.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 47,Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants for pain Page(s): 63-64. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter-medications for chronic pain; muscle relaxants; cyclobenzaprine.

Decision rationale: The prescription for Flexeril (Cyclobenzaprine) 7.5 mg #120 is recommended for the short-term treatment of muscle spasms and not for the long-term treatment

of chronic pain. The patient has been prescribed muscle relaxers on a long-term basis contrary to the recommendations of the CA MTUS. The patient is prescribed muscle relaxers on a routine basis for chronic pain. The muscle relaxers are directed to the relief of muscle spasms. The chronic use of muscle relaxants is not recommended by the CA MTUS, the ACOEM Guidelines, or the Official Disability Guidelines for the treatment of chronic pain. The use of muscle relaxants are recommended to be prescribed only briefly in a short course of therapy. There is no medical necessity demonstrated for the use of muscle relaxants for more than the initial short-term treatment of muscle spasms. There is a demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription of muscle relaxers on a routine basis for chronic back and hip pain. The Cyclobenzaprine was used as an adjunct treatment for muscle and there is demonstrated medical necessity for the Cyclobenzaprine for the cited industrial injury. The continued prescription of a muscle relaxant was not consistent with the evidence-based guidelines. The California MTUS states that Cyclobenzaprine is recommended for a short course of therapy. Limited, mixed evidence does not allow for a recommendation for chronic use. Cyclobenzaprine is a skeletal muscle relaxant and a central nervous system depressant with similar effects to tricyclic antidepressants. Evidence-based guidelines state that this medication is not recommended to be used for longer than 2 to 3 weeks. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription of Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 mg #120 for the effects of the industrial injury. The request is not medically necessary.