

Case Number:	CM14-0072470		
Date Assigned:	08/08/2014	Date of Injury:	10/25/2011
Decision Date:	12/23/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/08/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/19/2014

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 Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture and Pain 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 39 year old male who sustained a work related injury on October 25, 2011. The injured worker was diagnosed with lumbago. A progress note dated June 9, 2014 notes that the injured worker had constant sharp low back pain radiating to the lower extremities. The pain was aggravated by movement, prolonged sitting, standing and walking several blocks. Physical examination revealed palpable paravertebral muscle tenderness with spasm. A seated nerve root test was positive. Range of motion was noted to be guarded and restricted. Sensation and strength were normal. The injured worker's pain was noted to be unchanged from prior examinations. There is limited documentation submitted for review. A request for authorization on April 25, 2014 was for Naproxen Sodium 550 mg # 120, Tramadol ER 150 mg # 90, Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 mg # 120, Omeprazole 20 mg # 120, Ondansetron 8 mg ODT # 30 and Terocin Patch # 30. On May 8, 2014 Utilization Review (UR) evaluated and denied the medication requests. Regarding the Naproxen Sodium, Cyclobenzaprine and the Terocin Patch the medications were denied due to a lack of medical records that would present current pain complaints and medications that the injured worker was taking. Tramadol ER was denied due to a lack of information regarding the injured workers current condition. The Omeprazole was denied due to inadequate documentation of medical necessity for the non steroidal anti-inflammatory drug. Ondansetron was denied due to no documentation of ongoing complaints of nausea and vomiting and no current medical records that would present current pain complaints and medications the injured worker was taking.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Naproxen Sodium Tab 550MG #120: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non- Steroidal Anti- Inflammatory Drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68.

Decision rationale: With regard to the use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) for chronic low back pain, the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines states "Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another." "Low back pain (chronic): Both acetaminophen and NSAIDs have been recommended as first line therapy for low back pain. There is insufficient evidence to recommend one medication over the other. Selection should be made on a case-by-case basis based on weighing efficacy vs. side effect profile." I respectfully disagree with the UR physician. The MTUS does not mandate documentation of significant functional benefit for the continued use of NSAIDs. Naproxen is indicated for the injured worker's low back pain. The request is medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150MG #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4 s' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records lacks documentation to support the medical necessity of tramadol nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating

physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Cyclobenzaprine 7.5MG #120: Overturned

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 Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63-64.

Decision rationale: With regard to muscle relaxants, the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines 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." Regarding Cyclobenzaprine: "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 (e.g. amitriptyline). Cyclobenzaprine is more effective than placebo in the management of back pain, although the effect is modest and comes at the price of adverse effects." The request is indicated for the injured worker's low back pain. I respectfully disagree with the UR physician's assertion that cyclobenzaprine has been in use long-term, the medical records submitted do not contain evidence that this is the case. The request is medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20MG #120: 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 & Cardiovascular Risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: In the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy, the MTUS recommends stopping the NSAID, switching to a different NSAID, or considering the use of an H2-receptor antagonist or a PPI. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of proton pump inhibitors in conjunction with NSAIDs in situations in which the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events including: (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). Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines further specify: "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 gm 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. Patients at high risk of gastrointestinal events with cardiovascular disease: If GI risk is high the suggestion is for a low-dose Cox-2 plus low dose Aspirin (for cardioprotection) and a PPI. If cardiovascular risk is greater than GI risk the suggestion is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. (Laine, 2006) (Scholmerich, 2006) (Nielsen, 2006) (Chan, 2004) (Gold, 2007) (Laine, 2007)" As there is no documentation of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation, or cardiovascular disease in the records available for my review, the injured worker's risk for gastrointestinal events is low, as such, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Ondansetron 8MG ODT #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines Treatment in Worker's Compensation- Opioid for Nausea

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Antiemetics

Decision rationale: The MTUS is silent on the use of ondansetron. With regard to antiemetics, the ODG states "Not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Recommended for acute use as noted below per FDA-approved indications." Specifically, "Ondansetron (Zofran): This drug is a serotonin 5-HT₃ receptor antagonist. It is FDA-approved for nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment. It is also FDA-approved for postoperative use. Acute use is FDA-approved for gastroenteritis." As the injured worker is not postoperative or experiencing nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment, or gastroenteritis, ondansetron is not recommended. There was no documentation suggesting the ongoing necessity of the medication or its efficacy. The request is not medically necessary.

Terocin Patch #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 25, 60, 105, 111-113.

Decision rationale: Terocin is capsaicin, lidocaine, menthol, methyl salicylate, and boswellia serrata. Capsaicin may have an indication for chronic lower back pain in this context. Per MTUS

p 112 "Indications: There are positive randomized studies with capsaicin cream in patients with osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic non-specific back pain, but it should be considered experimental in very high doses. Although topical capsaicin has moderate to poor efficacy, it may be particularly useful (alone or in conjunction with other modalities) in patients whose pain has not been controlled successfully with conventional therapy." Methyl salicylate may have an indication for chronic pain in this context. Per MTUS p105, "Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004)." However, the other ingredients in Terocin are not indicated. The preponderance of evidence indicates that overall this medication is not medically necessary. Regarding topical lidocaine, MTUS states (p112) "Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995). " Per MTUS p25 Boswellia Serrata Resin is not recommended for chronic pain. Terocin topical lotion contains menthol. The CA MTUS, ODG, National Guidelines Clearinghouse, and ACOEM provide no evidence-based recommendations regarding the topical application of menthol. It is the opinion of this IMR reviewer that a lack of endorsement, a lack of mention, inherently implies a lack of recommendation, or a status equivalent to "not recommended". Since menthol is not medically indicated, then the overall product is not indicated per MTUS as outlined below. Note the statement on page 111: Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. Regarding the use of multiple medications, MTUS p60 states "Only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) The recent AHRQ review of comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesics for osteoarthritis concluded that each of the analgesics was associated with a unique set of benefits and risks, and no currently available analgesic was identified as offering a clear overall advantage compared with the others." Therefore, it would be optimal to trial each medication individually.