

Case Number:	CM14-0186332		
Date Assigned:	11/14/2014	Date of Injury:	07/31/2009
Decision Date:	01/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/08/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/10/2014

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 Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in 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:

59y/o male injured worker with date of injury 7/31/09 with related low back pain. Per progress report dated 9/19/14, the injured worker reported that pain medication only helped a little and beyond that he was not able to do much, without opioids he stated he could not even do activities of daily living. He also complained of neck, left shoulder, and left wrist and forearm pain. Per physical exam, tenderness was noted about the right shoulder, mildly positive impingement was noted. Tenderness was noted about the AC region of the left shoulder. He was status post L2-L3 fusion 7/2011, status post left shoulder arthroscopy 2/2011. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medication management. The date of UR decision was 10/8/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Oxycontin: Upheld

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): 78, 92.

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 oxycontin 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. Furthermore, the request does not contain dosage or quantity information. Therefore this request is not medically necessary.

Oxycodone IR: Upheld

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): 78, 92.

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 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 oxycodone 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. Furthermore, the request does not contain dosage or quantity information. Therefore this request is not medically necessary.

Celebrex 200mg with 3 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS Page(s): 70.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS CPMTG p70, Celebrex is used for the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, and ankylosing spondylitis. It works as an anti-inflammatory, analgesic, and antipyretic. It does not have an anti-platelet effect and is not a substitute for aspirin for cardiac prophylaxis. The documentation submitted for review contains no evidence that the injured worker was refractory to treatment with ibuprofen or naproxen. The MTUS supports the use of Cox-2 inhibitors for individuals with an increased risk or history of GI complications. The documentation did not note any history of GI complications, or risk factors for GI complications. While it is noted that NSAIDs are clinically indicated for this claimant, the requested Celebrex is not supported by the guidelines. This request is considered not medically necessary.

Nexium: 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). CPMTG 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 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. 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)"Per ODG TWC, "many prescribers believe that this class of drugs is innocuous, but much information is available to demonstrate otherwise. A trial of omeprazole or lansoprazole is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line."While it is noted in the documentation that the injured worker has GERD symptomatology due to opioids, there is no documentation of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation, or cardiovascular disease in the records available for my review. As noted per the guidelines, Nexium is a second-line medication. The medical records do not establish whether the patient has failed attempts at first line PPIs, such as omeprazole or lansoprazole, which should be considered prior to prescribing a second line PPI such as Nexium. The request is not medically necessary. Furthermore, the request does not specify dosage or quantity information.

Voltaren gel 2-4 grams 110 gram tubes #5 tubes per month: Overturned

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): 111-112.

Decision rationale: With regard to topical NSAIDs, MTUS states "These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. (Mason, 2004) Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks)."Voltaren Gel 1% specifically is "Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist)."The documentation submitted for review support the use of this medication as the structure of the wrist lends itself to topical treatment. I respectfully disagree with the UR physician's assertion that the guidelines state it is necessary to fail anticonvulsants prior to treatment with topical NSAIDs. Therefore this request is medically necessary.

Lidoderm patch 5%: 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): 111-112.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p112 states "Lidocaine Indication: Neuropathic pain Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). Topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch

(Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. The medical records submitted for review do not indicate that there has been a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI antidepressants or an AED). There is also no diagnosis of diabetic neuropathy or post-herpetic neuralgia. As such, lidoderm is not recommended at this time. The request is not medically necessary.