

Case Number:	CM15-0187718		
Date Assigned:	09/29/2015	Date of Injury:	07/29/2013
Decision Date:	12/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/24/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency 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 49 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 7-29-13 from a slip and fall injuring her back and hitting her head. She is not working. The medical records indicate that the injured worker is being treated for cervical radiculopathy; cervical disc degeneration; chronic pain; lumbar disc degeneration; lumbar facet arthropathy; lumbar radiculopathy; anxiety; depression; gastroesophageal reflux disorder; posttraumatic head syndrome; depression. She currently (8-19-15) complains of neck pain radiating down bilateral upper extremities aggravated by walking; low back pain radiating down bilateral lower extremities, aggravated by walking; upper extremity pain bilaterally in the arms and hands; lower extremity pain in both legs. Her pain has worsened since her last visit. Her pain level with medications was 7 out of 10. She has ongoing activities of daily living limitations in the areas of self-care and hygiene, activity, ambulation, hand function, sleep and sex due to pain. On physical exam of the cervical spine revealed spasms bilaterally in the trapezius and paraspinous muscles, tenderness on palpation; myofascial trigger points with twitch response were noted in the trapezius muscles bilaterally, levator and rhomboids bilaterally, painful range of motion, decreased strength in the extensor and flexor muscles bilaterally; lumbar spine revealed spasms, tenderness on palpation, decreased and painful range of motion, decreased sensitivity to touch along the L4-S1 dermatome in bilateral lower extremities, positive seated straight leg raise on the right and left for radicular pain. Her pain level was unchanged from 7-22-15 to 8-19-15 and on 4-7-15, it was 5 out of 10. Her physical exams were unchanged form 4-7-15 through 8-19-15. She has been on hydrocodone since at least 7-29-13 per 7-23-15 note and naproxen, gabapentin,

duloxetine, omeprazole since 4-30-14. Diagnostics include electromyography-nerve conduction study (8-11-12) showing moderate bilateral mixed motor and sensory median nerve carpal tunnel at the wrists. Treatments to date include selective catheterization bilateral C4-6 (7-7-15) with 50-80% overall improvement; medications: naproxen, omeprazole, gabapentin, pantoprazole, hydrocodone, duloxetine, medications offer 50% improvement with self-care, stair climbing, shopping, sitting, sleeping, standing; transforaminal epidural steroid injection was helpful; physical therapy; psychiatric consult. On 8-24-15, Utilization Review, non-certified the requests for naproxen 550mg #60; omeprazole 20mg #30; pantoprazole 20 mg #60; gabapentin 600mg #30; hydrocodone 5-325mg #30; duloxetine DR 30 mg #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Naproxen 550mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic)/NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): 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) Back Pain - Acute low back pain & acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting to negative evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. (Van Tulder, 2006) (Hancock, 2007) For patients with acute low back pain with sciatica a recent Cochrane review (including three heterogeneous randomized controlled trials) found no differences in treatment with NSAIDs vs. placebo. In patients with axial low back pain this same review found that NSAIDs were not more effective than acetaminophen for acute low-back pain, and that acetaminophen had fewer side effects. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) The addition of NSAIDs or spinal manipulative therapy does not appear to increase recovery in patients with acute low back pain over that received with acetaminophen treatment and advice from their physician. (Hancock, 2007) 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. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) See also Anti-inflammatory medications. 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 pain and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in patients with neuropathic pain. (Namaka, 2004) (Gore, 2006) See NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk; NSAIDs, hypertension and renal function; & Medications for acute pain (analgesics). Besides the above well-documented side effects of NSAIDs, there are other less well-known effects of NSAIDs, and the use of NSAIDs has been shown to possibly delay and hamper healing in all the soft tissues, including muscles, ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. (Maroon, 2006) The risks of NSAIDs in older patients, which include increased cardiovascular risk and gastrointestinal toxicity, may outweigh the benefits of these medications. (AGS, 2009) As stated above, acetaminophen would be considered first-line treatment for chronic pain. In this case, the continued use of an NSAID is not supported. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of functional improvement benefit seen. Also, the duration of use places the patient at risk for gastrointestinal and cardiovascular side-effects. In addition, it is known that use of NSAIDs delays the healing of soft tissue including ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20mg #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 Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of a proton pump inhibitor. It is indicated for patients with peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain. Unfortunately, they do have certain side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(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)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not medically necessary.

Pantoprazole 20mg #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 Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of a proton pump inhibitor. It is indicated for patients with peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain. Unfortunately, they do have certain side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(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)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 600mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the category of an anti-epileptic drug (AED). These medications are recommended for certain types of neuropathic pain. Most of the randomized clinical control trials involved include post-herpetic neuralgia and painful polyneuropathy such as in diabetes. There are few trials which have studied central pain or radiculopathy. The MTUS guidelines state that a good response to treatment is 50% reduction in pain. At least a 30% reduction in pain is required for ongoing use, and if this is not seen, this should trigger a change in therapy. Their also should be documentation of functional improvement and side effects incurred with use. Disease states, which prompt use of these medications, include post-herpetic neuralgia, spinal cord injury, chronic regional pain syndrome, lumbar spinal stenosis, post-operative pain, and central pain. There is inadequate evidence to support use in non-specific axial low back pain or myofascial pain. In this case, there is lack of documentation of functional improvement or screening measures as required. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Hydrocodone 5/325mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the opioid class. The MTUS guidelines state that for ongoing treatment with a pharmaceutical in this class, certain requirements are necessary. This includes not only adequate pain control, but also functional

improvement. Four domains have been proposed for management of patients on opioids. This includes pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. As part of the pain treatment agreement, it is advised that "Refills are limited, and will only occur at appointments". In this case, there is inadequate documentation of persistent functional improvement seen. As such, the request is not medically necessary. All opioid medications should be titrated down slowly in order to prevent a significant withdrawal syndrome.

Duloxetine DR 30mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain(chronic)/Antidepressants for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: Medications in the class of antidepressants are recommended as a first line option for neuropathic pain, and as a possibility for non-neuropathic pain. (Feuerstein, 1997) (Perrot, 2006) They are generally considered a first-line agent unless they are ineffective, poorly tolerated, or contraindicated. Analgesia generally occurs within a few days to a week, whereas antidepressant effect usually takes longer to occur. (Saarto-Cochrane, 2005) Assessment of treatment efficacy should include not only pain outcomes, but also an evaluation of function, changes in use of other analgesic medication, sleep quality/duration, and psychological assessment. Side effects can include excessive sedation and should be assessed. It is recommended that these outcome measurements should be initiated at one week of treatment with a recommended trial of at a minimum of 4 weeks. It has been suggested that if pain is in remission for 3-6 months, a gradual tapering of anti-depressants can be undertaken. In this case, the use of this medication is not certified for use based on the lack of documented functional improvement seen. Pending submission of the required treatment efficacy and evaluation of function, the request is not medically necessary.