

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0022131		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/11/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/24/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/26/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/06/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/05/2015

### 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: District of Columbia, Virginia  
Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal 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 54 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/24/2011. On provider visit dated 12/02/2014 the injured worker reported chronic pain. On examination he was noted to have increased muscle spasms to palpation over paralumbar area and tenderness with sciatica. The diagnoses have included lumbar disc disease, leg sciatic and depression/ anxiety. Treatment to date has included medication. Treatment plan included change hydrocodone-acetaminophen 10/325mg oral table take one to two tablets every six hours as needed for pain to hydrocodone-acetaminophen 10/325mg take one table four times a day as needed for pain and refill prescription for Meloxicam. On 01/06/2015 Utilization Review modified Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen 10/325mg #30 and Meloxicam 15mg #30 with 2 refills. The CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Hydrocodone/ACET 10/325mg #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792  
Page(s): 75-79.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS: Short-acting opioids: also known as "normal-release" or "immediate-release" opioids are seen as an effective method in controlling chronic pain. They are often used for intermittent or breakthrough pain. These agents are often combined with other analgesics such as acetaminophen and aspirin. These adjunct agents may limit the upper range of dosing of shortacting agents due to their adverse effects. The duration of action is generally 3-4 hours. Shortacting opioids include Morphine (Roxanol), Oxycodone (OxyIR, Oxyfast), Endocodone, Oxycodone with acetaminophen, (Roxilox, Roxicet, Percocet, Tylox, Endocet), Hydrocodone with acetaminophen, (Vicodin, Lorcet, Lortab, Zydone, Hydrocet, Norco), Hydromorphone (Dilaudid, Hydrostat). (Baumann, 2002) The patient has chronic pain issues and did not have much relief from short term usage of opiates. Per guidelines, long term usage of this medication would not be indicated.

**Meloxicam 15mg #30 with 2 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792  
Page(s): 61,67-68.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS: Mobiq is an NSAID. NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) 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 naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting 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 and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. (Namaka, 2004) (Gore, 2006) See NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk; NSAIDs, hypertension and renal function. 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 patient had chronic pain issues and was being recommended to wean off narcotic-based medication. Initial review recommended this medication with refill to aid in the transition period off this narcotic. However, long term usage of this medication would not be indicated. The patient has been on this medication since September 2014 and further usage of this medication would not be indicated.