

Case Number:	CM14-0206213		
Date Assigned:	12/18/2014	Date of Injury:	01/09/2012
Decision Date:	02/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/04/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/09/2014

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 North Carolina. 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 34-year-old with a reported date of injury of 01/09/2012. The patient has the diagnoses of major depression, chronic pain disorder, head trauma, fracture and loss of left upper teeth, cervical sprain/strain, cervical disc protrusion, lumbar sprain/strain TMJ disorder, orbital fracture/left eye blindness, trigeminal nerve injury. Past surgical procedures have included internal fixation of the left frontal sinus, bone graft, nose graft and left eye enucleation. Past treatment modalities have included acupuncture, lumbar epidural steroid injections, interferential unit and biofeedback. Per the most recent progress notes provided for review from the treating physician dated 10/27/2014, the patient had complaints of headaches and lumbar spine pain with radiation to the right leg. The physical exam noted no new abnormalities or specific findings. Treatment plan recommendations included neurology consult, urology consult and continuation of medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Flexeril 7.5mg #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)
Treatment Workers Compensation TWC

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63-66.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP 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. (Homik, 2004) The long term chronic use of this medication is not recommended per the California MTUS. There is no provided documentation to show that the medication has been prescribed for short term used to treat acute flares of chronic low back pain. The medication is generally not indicated for periods greater than 2-3 weeks. In the absence of such documentation, the request cannot be certified.

Motrin 800mg #90: Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID Page(s): 71-73.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guideline section on NSAID therapy states: Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with Naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) Naproxen (Naprosyn): delayed release (EC-Naprosyn), as Sodium salt (Anaprox, Anaprox DS, Aleve [OTC]) Generic available; extended-release (Naprelan): 375 mg. Different dose strengths and formulations of the drug are not necessarily bioequivalent. Dosing Information: Osteoarthritis or ankylosing spondylitis: Dividing the daily dose into 3 doses versus 2 doses for immediate-release and delayed-release formulations generally does not affect response. Morning and evening doses do not have to be equal in size. The dose may be increased to 1500 mg/day of Naproxyn for limited periods when a higher level of analgesic/anti-inflammatory activity is required (for up to 6 months). This medication is recommended at the lowest possible dose for the shortest period of time. The duration of "shortest period of time" is

not defined in the California MTUS. The dose prescribed however is not in excess of the highest recommended dose for this NSAID. The patient has no mentioned renal or cardiovascular risk factors that would preclude the use of this medication. Therefore the request is certified.

Prilosec 20mg #60: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID use and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: 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 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. 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 supplied documentation that places this patient at intermediate or severe gastrointestinal risk that would require a use of a PPI with NSAID therapy. The patient has seen a gastroenterologist for constipation. For these reasons the criteria as set forth above have not been met for the use of the medication. Therefore the request is not certified.