

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0073951		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/16/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/09/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/17/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/02/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/21/2014

### 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:

The 53y/o male injured worker is with date of injury 4/17/01 with related neck and shoulder pain. Per progress report dated 2/13/14, the injured worker complained of persistent neck pain, stiffness, and intermittent shoulder pain radiating to the upper extremities. Per physical exam, tenderness was noted over the posterior cervical, bilateral trapezius musculature, as well as the mid thoracic paravertebral musculature. The documentation submitted for review did not state whether physical therapy was utilized. Treatment to date has included chiropractic manipulation, and medication management. The date of UR decision was 5/2/14.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Naprosyn 500mg #60 with 2 refills:** Overturned

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

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

**Decision rationale:** Current guidelines note that evidence is limited to make an initial recommendation with acetaminophen, and that NSAIDs may be more efficacious for treatment. The selection of acetaminophen as a first-line treatment appears to be made primarily based on

side effect profile in osteoarthritis guidelines. The most recent Cochrane review on this subject suggests that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are more efficacious for osteoarthritis in terms of pain reduction, global assessments and improvement of functional status. Based on the clinical information and MTUS the request is indicated for the injured worker's persistent neck and shoulder pain. Therefore, Naprosyn 500mg #60 with 2 refills is medically necessary and appropriate.

**Ultram 50mg #120 with 2 refills:** 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): 78, 93.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing 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 A'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 reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Ultram or 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 review. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

**Norco 325mg #45 with 2 refills:** 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): 78, 91.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing 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 As' (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 reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of norco 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.

**Ambien CR 12.5mg #30 with 2 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG-TWC Pain Procedure Summary and Mosby's Drug Consult

**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), Zolpidem (Ambien)

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS is silent on the treatment of insomnia. With regard to Ambien, the ODG guidelines state "Zolpidem is a prescription short-acting nonbenzodiazepine hypnotic, which is approved for the short-term (usually two to six weeks) treatment of insomnia. Proper sleep hygiene is critical to the individual with chronic pain and often is hard to obtain. Various medications may provide short-term benefit. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers, and anti-anxiety agents are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. They can be habit-forming, and they may impair function and memory more than opioid pain relievers. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term." The documentation submitted for review do not contain information regarding sleep onset, sleep maintenance, sleep quality, and next-day functioning. It was not noted whether simple sleep hygiene methods were tried and failed. The request is not medically necessary.