MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0197414		
Date Assigned:	10/12/2015	Date of Injury:	11/03/2002
Decision Date:	12/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/07/2015

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: Arizona, Michigan
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 62 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on November 03, 2002. A pain management follow up visit dated August 31, 2015 reported chief subjective complaint of: "chronic, severe, low back pain and bilateral leg pain with weakness." He is status post anterior and posterior decompression and fusion along with hardware removal. Current medications listed: Xanax, Ambien, Dilaudid, Losartan, Linaclotide, Omeprazole, Tylenol, and Zanaflex. The current assessment noted: chronic severe low back pain and bilateral leg pain; history of fusion L4-5 L5-S1; severe neuropathic pain; analgesia dependency with tolerance; constipation with medication; poor sleep hygiene and status post IPG lead placement. Medications trialed and failed included: Nucynta ER, Norco, Percocet, Methadone, and Lyrica. The following was prescribed this visit: Horizant. Primary follow up dated March 2015 reported that from "this perspective the patient is experiencing a decrease in the effectiveness of the spinal cord stimulator, as he otherwise would not have to be put on Methadone and Dilaudid." There is noted discussion regarding transfer of primary care to enable both medication and spinal cord stimulator continuity of care. The plan of care noted continuing: Prilosec, Ambien, Losartan, and Xanax. On September 02, 2015 a request was made for Dilaudid that was noncertified by Utilization review on September 16, 2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Dilaudid 4mg, #120: Overturned

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): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, opioids should be discontinued if there is no overall improvement in function, unless there are extenuating circumstances, Opioids should be continued if the patient has returned to work or has improved functioning and pain. Ongoing management actions should include prescriptions from a single practitioner, taken as directed and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. Documentation should follow the 4 A's of analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors. Long term users of opioids should be regularly reassessed. In the maintenance phase the dose should not be lowered if it is working. Also, patients who receive opioid therapy may sometimes develop unexpected changes in their response to opioids, which includes development of abnormal pain, change in pain pattern, persistence of pain at higher levels than expected when this happens opioids can actually increase rather than decrease sensitivity to noxious stimuli. It is important to note that a decrease in opioid efficacy should not always be treated by increasing the dose or adding other opioids, but may actually require weaning. A review of the injured workers medical records reveal a complex history of ongoing severe low back pain with neuropathy, he is status post surgical intervention as well as has a spinal cord stimulator in place, based on his current clinical presentation, the continued use of Dilaudid is medically appropriate, therefore the request for Dilaudid 4mg, #120 is medically necessary.

Linzess 290gms, #30: Overturned

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): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, prophylactic treatment of constipation should be started when initiated treatment with opioids. Linzess is used in the treatment of chronic constipation, its use appears indicated in this injured worker on chronic opioid therapy. Therefore the request for Linzess 290gms, #30 is medically necessary.

Xanax 0.5mg, #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): Benzodiazepines.

Decision rationale: The MTUS does not recommend long term use of benzodiazepines , long term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence, most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Tolerance to all of its effects develop within weeks to months, and long term use may actually increase anxiety, a more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. A review of the injured workers medical records do not reveal extenuating circumstances that would warrant continuation of this medication, continued use is not appropriate, therefore the request for Xanax 0.5mg, #60 is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg, #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) / Zolpidem (Ambien).

Decision rationale: The MTUS did not specifically address the use of Ambien, therefore other guidelines were consulted. Per the ODG, Zolpidem is a prescription short-acting non-benzodiazepine hypnotic, which is recommended for short-term (7-10 days) treatment of insomnia. Proper sleep hygiene is critical to the individual with chronic pain and often is hard to obtain. Various medications may provide short-term benefit. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers, and anti-anxiety agents are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. They can be habit-forming, and they may impair function and memory more than opioid pain relievers. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term, however given the risks there is no clear indication for the continued use of this medication in the injured worker, the risks outweigh the benefits and the continued use of ambien is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 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 based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) / Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs).

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Clinicians should weigh the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors according to specific criteria listed in the MTUS and a selection should be made based on these criteria 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). Per the ODG, PPI's are "Recommended for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events. Prilosec (omeprazole), Prevacid (lansoprazole) and Nexium (esomeprazole magnesium) are PPIs. Healing doses of PPIs are more effective than all other therapies, although there is an increase in overall adverse effects compared to placebo. Nexium and Prilosec are very similar molecules. (Donnellan, 2010) In this RCT omeprazole provided a statistically significantly greater acid control than lansoprazole. (Miner, 2010) In general, the use of a PPI should be limited to the recognized indications and used at the lowest dose for the shortest possible amount of time. PPIs are highly effective for their approved indications, including preventing gastric ulcers induced by NSAIDs. Studies suggest, however, that nearly half of all PPI prescriptions are used for unapproved indications or no indications at all. Many prescribers believe that this class of drugs is innocuous, but much information is available to demonstrate otherwise. Products in this drug class have demonstrated equivalent clinical efficacy and safety at comparable doses, including esomeprazole (Nexium), lansoprazole (Prevacid), omeprazole (Prilosec), pantoprazole (Protonix), dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and rabeprazole (Aciphex). (Shi, 2008) A trial of omeprazole or lansoprazole had been recommended before prescription Nexium therapy (before it went OTC). The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)" A review of the injured workers medical records do not reveal any past or current gastrointestinal complaints that would indicate that the injured worker is at increased risk for a gastrointestinal event, therefore the request for Prilosec 20mg, #60 is not medically necessary.