

Case Number:	CM14-0115574		
Date Assigned:	08/04/2014	Date of Injury:	04/20/2010
Decision Date:	01/27/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/23/2014

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 Practice 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:

52 yr. old female claimant sustained a work injury on 4/20/10 involving the low back and right knee. She was diagnosed with lumbar radiculopathy and internal derangement of the right knee. She had additional diagnosed of GERD and analgesic induced constipation along with gastroparesis. In 2012 she had electrodiagnostic studies that showed chronic S1 radiculopathy. She had undergone a right knee arthroscopic surgery in 2012 with synovectomy, meniscectomy and chondroplasty. She subsequently underwent a knee arthroplasty. In July 2014 she was noted to ben on Tramadol for pain, Omeprazole for GERD, Orphenadrine for muscle relaxation and Ondansetron for nausea. She had an infected prosthesis and underwent removal of the hardware in October 2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ondansetron 8mg ODT PRN #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Decision rationale: According to the ODG guidelines, antiemetics are not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Zofran (Odansetron) 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. In this case, the claimant does not have the above diagnoses and Odansetron is not medically necessary.

Orphenadrine Citrate ER 100mg Q8HRS PRN #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63.

Decision rationale: Orphenadrine is a muscle relaxant that is similar to diphenhydramine, but has greater anticholinergic effects. According to the MTUS guidelines, muscle relaxants are to be used with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most low back pain 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. In this case, the claimant had been on Orphenadrine along with other analgesics. It was prescribed for over a month. Continued use is not medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150mg OD #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 92-93.

Decision rationale: Tramadol is a synthetic opioid affecting the central nervous system. According to the MTUS guidelines, Tramadol is recommended on a trial basis for short-term use after there has been evidence of failure of first-line non-pharmacologic and medication options (such as acetaminophen or NSAIDs) and when there is evidence of moderate to severe pain. Although it may be a good choice in those with back pain, the claimant's pain increased persisted over time while on the medication. She had been on Tramadol for several months without recent notation of pain scale or functional response. The continued use of Tramadol as above is not medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20mg q12hrs PRN #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs
Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is a proton pump inhibitor that is to be used with NSAIDs for those with high risk of GI events such as bleeding, perforation, and concurrent anticoagulation/anti-platelet use. In this case, there is no documentation of GI events or antiplatelet use that would place the claimant at risk. Therefore, the continued use of Omeprazole is not medically necessary.