

Case Number:	CM14-0071673		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2014	Date of Injury:	07/10/2007
Decision Date:	07/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/13/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/19/2014

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 61 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/10/07. Initial complaints were not reviewed. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral spondylosis without myelopathy; neck pain; cervical spondylosis without myelopathy; disorders of the back. Treatment to date has included status post left suboccipital nerve block (8/14/13); status post diagnostic left C2-3 and C3-4 facet joint injections (9/13/13); urine drug screening; medications. Diagnostics included EMG/NCV upper extremities (5/12/14). Currently, the PR-2 notes dated 2/13/14 indicated the injured worker complains headaches, bilateral neck pain, bilateral shoulder pain, bilateral arm pain, bilateral lower back pain and bilateral leg pain. He indicates the pain is persistent and sometimes severe. He has had good results from his cervical and lumbar epidural steroid injections and occipital nerve blocks. He is hoping he can get these repeated as his pain is gradually becoming worse. He rates the pain as 7/10 and describes his overall pain as deep, aching in the occipital and left temporal and the neck, upper extremities and low back and lower extremities as shooting, stabbing. The provider is requesting: Zanaflex 4mg #30; Naproxen Sodium 550mg #60 2 refills; Prilosec 20 mg #60; Opana ER 10mg #60 and Colace 100mg #180.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Zanaflex 4mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-67.

Decision rationale: Zanaflex is the brand name version of tizanidine, which is a muscle relaxant. MTUS states concerning muscle relaxants; "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) (VanTulder, 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) Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. These drugs should be used with caution in patients driving motor vehicles or operating heavy machinery. Drugs with the most limited published evidence in terms of clinical effectiveness include chlorzoxazone, methocarbamol, dantrolene and baclofen. (Chou, 2004) According to a recent review in American Family Physician, skeletal muscle relaxants are the most widely prescribed drug class for musculoskeletal conditions (18.5% of prescriptions), and the most commonly prescribed antispasmodic agents are carisoprodol, cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, and methocarbamol, but despite their popularity, skeletal muscle relaxants should not be the primary drug class of choice for musculoskeletal conditions. (See2, 2008)." MTUS further states, "Tizanidine (Zanaflex, generic available) is a centrally acting alpha2-adrenergic agonist that is FDA approved for management of spasticity; unlabeled use for low back pain. (Malanga, 2008) Eight studies have demonstrated efficacy for low back pain. (Chou, 2007) One study (conducted only in females) demonstrated a significant decrease in pain associated with chronic myofascial pain syndrome and the authors recommended its use as a first line option to treat myofascial pain. (Malanga, 2002) May also provide benefit as an adjunct treatment for fibromyalgia. (ICSI, 2007)." There is no evidence of failure of first line therapies or of an acute exacerbation of pain. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Naproxen Sodium 550mg #60 2refills: 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): 63-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Naproxen, NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) Back Pain - Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs

were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. 4) Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long-term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. Additionally, the treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Progress notes do not indicate how long the patient has been on naproxen, but the MTUS guidelines recommend against long-term use. Dyesthesia pain is present, but as MTUS outlines, the evidence for NSAID use in neuropathic pain is inconsistent. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20 mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs; GI protection Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: MTUS states "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)." And "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)." The medical documents provided do not establish the patient has having documented GI bleeding/perforation/peptic ulcer or other GI risk factors as outlined in MTUS. Additionally, there is no evidence provided to indicate the patient suffers from dyspepsia because of the present medication regimen. As such, the request for Omeprazole is not medically necessary.

Opana ER 10mg #60: 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): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute and Chronic), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Opioids, Pain.

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck and low back pain except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks. The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that "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." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Colace 100mg #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Prophylactic treatment of constipation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 77. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Opioid-induced constipation treatment.

Decision rationale: This patient is undergoing treatment with an opioid. Opioids can commonly cause constipation and treatment to prevent constipation is recommended. ODG states that first line treatment should include physical activity, appropriate hydration by drinking enough water, and advising the patient to follow a proper diet, rich in fiber and some laxatives may help to stimulate gastric motility. Other over-the-counter medications can help loosen otherwise hard stools, add bulk, and increase water content of the stool. Uptodate states "Patients who respond poorly to fiber, or who do not tolerate it, may require laxatives other than bulk forming agents." Additionally, "There is little evidence to support the use of surfactant agents in chronic constipation. Stool softeners such as docusate sodium (e.g., Colace) are intended to lower the surface tension of stool, thereby allowing water to more easily enter the stool. Although these agents have few side effects, they are less effective than other laxatives." The treating physician does not document what first line treatments have been tried and what the results of those treatments are. Additionally, no quantitative or qualitative description of bowel movement frequency/difficulty was provided either pre or post constipation treatment education by the physician, which is important to understand if first line constipation treatment was successful. As such, the request is not medically necessary at this time.