

Case Number:	CM15-0202589		
Date Assigned:	10/19/2015	Date of Injury:	09/11/2009
Decision Date:	12/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/15/2015

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 43 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 09-11-2009. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker (IW) is undergoing treatment for chronic myofascial pain of the neck and back, cervical degenerative disc disease, right knee internal derangement, pain related insomnia, and bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. Medical records (to 09-03-2015) indicate ongoing neck, back, bilateral upper extremity and bilateral knee pain. Pain levels were rated 6 out of 10 in severity on a visual analog scale (VAS) without medications. Other complaints included gastric upset with nausea. Records also indicate no changes in activity levels or level of functioning. Per the treating physician's progress report (PR), the IW has not returned to work. The physical exam, dated 09-02-2015, revealed myofascial tenderness at the anterior aspects of the shoulders extending through the upper arms and forearms, positive Adson's maneuver bilaterally in the shoulders resulting in discoloration in the hands, positive Tinel's, Phalen's and Finkelstein's tests, tenderness to palpation throughout the cervical spine and paracervical muscles with noted spasms in the lower cervical paraspinals, positive Spurling's maneuver resulting in neuropathic symptoms into the bilateral C5 distributions, moderate-to-severe restricted range of motion (ROM) in the cervical spine, tenderness to palpation throughout the thoracic and lumbar spines and paraspinal musculature, medial and lateral joint line tenderness to both knees, positive McMurray's test on the right, slightly decreased flexion in the right knee, and crepitus noted in the left knee. Relevant treatments have included: right knee surgery, physical therapy (PT), work restrictions, and pain medications. Current medications include Percocet, Flexeril, Motrin, Phenergan, and Zantac

which were reported to reduce pain levels by 50% and decrease nausea and gastric upset. The request for authorization (09-30-2015) shows that the following medications were requested: Flexeril 10mg #60 with 1 refill, Motrin 800mg #60 with 1 refill, Phenergan 25mg #30, and Zantac 150mg #60 with 1 refill. The original utilization review (10-06-2015) partially approved the request for Flexeril 10mg #60 with 1 refill (modified to #20 with no refills), and non-certified the requests for Motrin 800mg #60 with 1 refill, Phenergan 25mg #30, and Zantac 150mg #60 with 1 refill.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Flexeril 10mg Qty. 60 with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) In this case, the use of a muscle relaxant is not guideline-supported. This is secondary to poor effectiveness for chronic long-term use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Motrin 800mg Qty. 60 with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

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: The request is for the use of a medication in the NSAID class. The ODG state the following regarding this topic: Specific recommendations: 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 naproxen 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.

Phenergan 25mg Qty. 30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Antiemetics (for opioid nausea).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of phenergan. There is a medication in the phenothiazine class and is usually used for nausea in certain circumstances. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue but the ODG state the following: Not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use, recommended for acute use as noted below per FDA-approved indications. Nausea and vomiting is common with use of opioids. These side effects tend to diminish over days to weeks of continued exposure. Studies of opioid adverse effects including nausea and vomiting are limited to short-term duration (less than four weeks) and have limited application to long-term use. If nausea and vomiting remains prolonged, other etiologies of these symptoms should be evaluated for. The differential diagnosis includes gastroparesis (primarily due to diabetes). Current research for treatment of nausea and vomiting as related to opioid use primarily addresses the use of antiemetics in patients with cancer pain or those utilizing opioids for acute/postoperative therapy. Recommendations based on these studies cannot be extrapolated to chronic non-malignant pain patients. There is no high-quality literature to support any one treatment for opioid-induced nausea in chronic non-malignant pain patients. (Moore 2005) Promethazine (Phenergan): This drug is a phenothiazine. It is recommended as a sedative and antiemetic in pre-operative and post-operative situations. Multiple central nervous system effects are noted with use including somnolence, confusion and sedation. Tardive dyskinesia is also associated with use. This is characterized by involuntary movements of the tongue, mouth, jaw, and/or face. Choreoathetoid movements of the extremities can also occur. Development appears to be associated with prolonged treatment and in some cases can be irreversible. Anticholinergic effects can occur (dry mouth, dry eyes, urinary retention and ileus). In this case, as indicated above, the patient does not qualify for the use of this medication. It is not indicated for use in patients who develop nausea or vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Zantac 150mg Qty. 60 with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation MD Consult Drug Monograph last updated 1/21/12.

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 an acid reducing medication. The guidelines do not specifically address or advise the use of an H2 blocker but does make recommendations regarding medications in the same category classified as proton pump inhibitors. This is usually given for patients with esophageal reflux, gastritis, or peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain which have side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically with a proton pump inhibitor or Misoprostol. 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 was not approved for the use of Motrin, the request for use is not indicated. There are no other listed qualifying factors as listed above. The request is not medically necessary.