

Case Number:	CM14-0107547		
Date Assigned:	08/01/2014	Date of Injury:	12/20/1998
Decision Date:	07/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/20/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/11/2014

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
 State(s) of Licensure: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 injured worker is a 51-year-old female, with a reported date of injury of 12/20/1998. The diagnoses include low back pain, lumbar radiculopathy, degeneration of lumbar intervertebral disc, displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy, and chronic pain syndrome. Treatments to date have included oral medications. The medical report dated 06/11/2014 indicates that the injured worker complained of low back pain with radiation to the right lower extremity. There was numbness and tingling in the bilateral lower extremity, and stiffness and spasm of the low back. The pain was rated 5 out of 10. The average pain score was 6 out of 10, the lowest pain score was 5 out of 10, and the worst pain was 9 out of 10. It was noted that there was interference with sleep/sleep disturbance and restless sleep. The objective findings include no abdominal pain, muscle aches and weakness, arthralgia/joint pain, back pain, and numbness and restless legs. It was noted that the physical examination was stable without focal motor or sensory changes. The injured worker still reported 35% decrease in pain with use of Percocet, with no side effects. The medical report dated 05/15/2014 indicates that the objective findings include muscle aches and weakness, an antalgic gait, and negative straight leg raise test. The injured worker reported 35% decrease in pain with use of Percocet, with no side effects. The pain rating were reported the same as the in the report dated 06/11/2014. The treating physician requested Percocet 7.5/325mg #45, Dexilant 30mg #30, and Ambien 10mg #10 with one refill.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Percocet 7.5/325mg, #45: Overturned

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

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 for ongoing management: 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 non-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 class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. These criteria have been met and the request is medically necessary.

Dexilant 30mg, #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 (ODG), Pain (Chronic) PPI (proton pump inhibitor).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID Page(s): 68-72.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Recommend with precautions as indicated below. 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 a 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 gastro duodenal 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 documentation provided that places this patient at intermediate or high risk that would justify the use of a PPI. There is no mention of current gastrointestinal or cardiovascular disease. For these reasons, the criteria set forth above per the California MTUS for the use of this medication has not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg, #10 with 1 refill: 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) Zolpidem (Ambien).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, ambien.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address the requested medication. PER the ODG: Zolpidem is a prescription short-acting non-benzodiazepine hypnotic approved for the short-term treatment of insomnia. Proper sleep hygiene is critical to the individual with chronic pain. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers and anti-anxiety medications are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term. The medication is not intended for use greater than 6 weeks. There is no notation or rationale given for longer use in the provided progress reports. There is no documentation of other preferred long-term insomnia intervention choices being tried and failed. For these reasons, the request is not medically necessary.

