

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0132335		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/20/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/05/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/26/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/09/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/08/2015

### 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 47 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on February 5, 2013. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervogenic headache, migraine like headache, cervical facet arthropathy and cervical radiculitis. Treatment to date has included medication and acupuncture. A progress note dated April 1, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of headaches and neck pain. She reports her pain 5/10 and has headaches more than 15 days a month. Physical exam notes tenderness over the mastoid process, cervical facets, and trapezius area with spasm and decreased range of motion (ROM). There is a request for nerve blocks and medication.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Bilateral occipital nerve blocks:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Head, Greater Occipital Nerve Block.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS is silent on occipital nerve blocks. Per ODG TWC, greater occipital nerve blocks are "Under study for use in treatment of primary headaches. Studies on the use of greater occipital nerve block (GONB) for treatment of migraine and cluster headaches show conflicting results, and when positive, have found response limited to a short-term duration. (Ashkenazi, 2005) (Inan, 2001) (Vincent, 1998) (Afridi, 2006) The mechanism of action is not understood, nor is there a standardized method of the use of this modality for treatment of primary headaches. A recent study has shown that GONB is not effective for treatment of chronic tension headache. (Leinisch, 2005) The block may have a role in differentiating between cervicogenic headaches, migraine headaches, and tension-headaches." The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker was previously treated with occipital block 5/2014 with a reported 50% decrease in pain and increase in ability to perform activities of daily living. I respectfully disagree with the UR physician's assertion that there was no evidence supporting repeat injection. The request is medically necessary.

**Norco 10/325mg #120:** 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, 91.

**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 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 norco nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the ongoing 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. It should be noted that the UR physician has certified a one month supply for the purpose of weaning.

**Orphenadrine 100mg #60: 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, 65.

**Decision rationale:** With regard to muscle relaxants, the MTUS 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." Regarding Orphenadrine: This drug is similar to diphenhydramine, but has greater anticholinergic effects. The mode of action is not clearly understood. Effects are thought to be secondary to analgesic and anticholinergic properties. This drug was approved by the FDA in 1959. Side Effects: Anticholinergic effects (drowsiness, urinary retention, dry mouth). Side effects may limit use in the elderly. This medication has been reported in case studies to be abused for euphoria and to have mood elevating effects. (Shariatmadari, 1975) As the guidelines do not recommend sedating muscle relaxants, the request is not medically necessary. It should be noted that the UR physician has certified a one month supply for the purpose of weaning.

**Omeprazole 20mg #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 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)" As there is no documentation of current NSAID therapy, 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. It should be noted that the UR physician has certified a one month supply for the purpose of weaning.