

Case Number:	CM14-0186393		
Date Assigned:	11/18/2014	Date of Injury:	06/04/2014
Decision Date:	02/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/30/2014
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 Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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 patient is a 39 year old man who sustained a work-related injury on June 4 2014. Subsequently, the patient developed a chronic low back pain. According to a progress report dated on August 11 2014, the patient was complaining of low back pain with numbness into both legs. The patient physical examination demonstrated lumbar tenderness with spasm and decreased range of motion and reduced sensation in the L5-S1 dermatoma bilaterally. The patient was diagnosed with low back pain and radiculitis. The provider requested authorization for the following medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Acupuncture evaluation and treatment x 6 for a trial for 2wk/2months: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, "Acupuncture" is used as an option when pain medication is reduced or not tolerated, it may be used as an adjunct to physical rehabilitation and/or surgical intervention to hasten functional recovery. It is the insertion and removal of filiform needles to stimulate acupoints (acupuncture points). Needles may be

inserted, manipulated, and retained for a period of time. Acupuncture can be used to reduce pain, reduce inflammation, increase blood flow, increase range of motion, decrease the side effect of medication-induced nausea, promote relaxation in an anxious patient, and reduce muscle spasm. Furthermore and according to MTUS guidelines, "Acupuncture with electrical stimulation" is the use of electrical current (micro-amperage or milli-amperage) on the needles at the acupuncture site. It is used to increase effectiveness of the needles by continuous stimulation of the acupoints. Physiological effects (depending on location and settings) can include endorphin release for pain relief, reduction of inflammation, increased blood circulation, analgesia through interruption of pain stimulus, and muscle relaxation. It is indicated to treat chronic pain conditions, radiating pain along a nerve pathway, muscle spasm, inflammation, scar tissue pain, and pain located in multiple sites. The patient developed chronic back pain and musculoskeletal disorders. He is a candidate for treatment with acupuncture. However the patient was authorized for a trial of 4 sessions of acupuncture. More sessions will be considered when functional and objective improvement are documented. Therefore, the request for Acupuncture Evaluation and Treatment 6 trial for 2wk/2mos is not medically necessary.

Deprizine: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms & Cardiovascular Risk Page(s): 102.

Decision rationale: Deprizine contains Ranitidine which is a histamine H2 receptor antagonist. According to MTUS guidelines, Ranitidine is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (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). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDs to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, Deprizine is not medically necessary.

Dicopanorl: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Wang, Y. Q., et al. (2015). "Doxepin and diphenhydramine increased non-rapid eye movement sleep through blockade of histamine H1 receptors." *Pharmacology Biochem Behave* 129: 56-64.

Decision rationale: Dicopanorl contains Diphenhydramine, a sedative and anti-histamine medication. There is no recent documentation that the patient developed insomnia or allergic

reaction to support the use of the medication. Therefore, Dicopanol prescription is not medically necessary.

Fanatrex: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Gabapentin Page(s): 49.

Decision rationale: Fanatrex contains Gabapentin which is a medication approved for neuropathic pain. According to MTUS guidelines, Gabapentin is an anti-epilepsy drug (AEDs - also referred to as anti-convulsants), which has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain.. There is no recent documentation that the patient developed a neuropathic pain. Therefore, the request for Fanatrex (Gabapentin) is not medically necessary.

Synapryn: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol, Criteria for Use of Opioids Page(s): 113, 76-79.

Decision rationale: Synapryn contains Tramadol and Glucosamine. According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. Although, Ultram may be needed to help with the patient pain, it may not help with the weaning process from opioids. Ultram could be used if exacerbation of pain after or during the weaning process. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules:(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: currentpain; 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. There is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement with previous use of opioids (Tramadol). There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tramadol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medication. There is no clear justification for the need to continue the use of Tramadol. Furthermore, MTUS does not support the use of Glucosamine for back pain. Therefore, the prescription of Synapryn is not medically necessary at this time.

Tabradol: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine Page(s): 41.

Decision rationale: Tabradol contains cyclobenzaprine. According to MTUS guidelines, non-sedating muscle relaxants are recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case does not have clear evidence of acute exacerbation of chronic back pain and spasm and the prolonged use of Tabradol is not justified. The request is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 308.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine Page(s): 41.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, a non-sedating muscle relaxant is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The patient in this case does not have clear evidence of acute exacerbation of chronic back pain and spasm and the prolonged use of Cyclobenzaprine is not justified. The request is not medically necessary.

Ketoprofen Cream: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 49, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. There is no proven efficacy of topical application of the component of Ketoprofen. Furthermore, oral form of these medications was not attempted, and there is no documentation of failure or adverse reaction from first line pain medications. Based on the above, the use of According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. There is no proven efficacy of topical application of the component of Ketoprofen cream. Furthermore, oral form of these medications was not attempted, and there is no documentation of failure or adverse reaction from first line pain medications. Based on the above, the use of Ketoprofen cream is not medically necessary.