

Case Number:	CM15-0108774		
Date Assigned:	06/15/2015	Date of Injury:	10/07/2011
Decision Date:	09/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/05/2015

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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 57 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 10/07/2011. He reported cumulative trauma to the left knee, low back and hip. Diagnoses include status post total left knee replacement on 1/2/14, chronic hip pain, lumbar spine degenerative disc disease, Perthes disease, right hip, acquired varus deformity, right upper femur, and chronic pain syndrome. Treatments to date include medication therapy and rehabilitation services. Currently, he complained of increasing pain in the right hip, and ongoing pain in the left knee, low and mid back. Medications were noted to increase function and decrease pain. On 5/5/15, the physical examination documented diffuse tenderness of the left knee. There was right hip tenderness and pain with range of motion. The plan of care included prescriptions for Oxycodone 15mg one tablet four times a day as needed, #120 decreased to #115 for one-month supply; Prilosec 20mg #30; and Topamax 25mg, one tablet once to twice a day #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Oxycodone 15 mg Qty 115: 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 Opioids Page(s): 78, 92.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p 78 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 A's' (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. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. It is noted that UDS was performed 9/6/13, 10/15/13, 6/13/14, and 11/19/14, however, results were not available for review. Per progress report dated 4/2015, it was noted that an opiate agreement was on file and CURES was checked. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Prilosec 20 mg Qty 30: 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, 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 mg 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 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)" As there is no documentation of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation, or cardiovascular disease in the records available for my review, the injured worker's risk for gastrointestinal events is low, as such, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Topamax 25 mg Qty 60: 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 Anti-epilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16, 21.

Decision rationale: With regard to anti-epilepsy drugs, the MTUS CPMTG states "Recommended for neuropathic pain (pain due to nerve damage). (Gilron, 2006) (Wolfe, 2004) (Washington, 2005) (ICSI, 2005) (Wiffen-Cochrane, 2005) (Attal, 2006) (Wiffen-Cochrane, 2007) (Gilron, 2007) (ICSI, 2007) (Finnerup, 2007) There is a lack of expert consensus on the treatment of neuropathic pain in general due to heterogeneous etiologies, symptoms, physical signs and mechanisms. Most randomized controlled trials (RCTs) for the use of this class of medication for neuropathic pain have been directed at postherpetic neuralgia and painful polyneuropathy (with diabetic polyneuropathy being the most common example). There are few RCTs directed at central pain and none for painful radiculopathy." Per MTUS CPMTG, "Topiramate (Topamax, no generic available) has been shown to have variable efficacy, with failure to demonstrate efficacy in neuropathic pain of "central" etiology. It is still considered for use for neuropathic pain when other anticonvulsants fail."The documentation submitted for review contains no evidence of failure of first line anticonvulsant such as gabapentin or pregabalin. As the MTUS guidelines consider it appropriate after failure of these medications, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.