

Case Number:	CM15-0215932		
Date Assigned:	11/05/2015	Date of Injury:	01/28/2015
Decision Date:	12/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/03/2015

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: Indiana, California

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 48-year-old female, who sustained an industrial-work injury on 1-28-15. She reported initial complaints of neck and low back pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having rule out lumbar disc injury and rule out cervical disc injury. Treatment to date has included medication (helpful) and physical therapy (not beneficial). Currently, the injured worker complains of cervical pain rated 7 out of 10 with right upper extremity symptoms and lower back pain with right lower extremity symptoms rated 6 out of 10. Meds included Hydrocodone 7.5 mg and Ibuprofen. Per the primary physician's progress report (PR-2) on 9-21-15, exam noted tenderness and decreased range of motion of the cervical spine, diminished sensation in the right L5 and S1 distribution, strength of 4+ out of 5, decreased lumbar range of motion, positive straight leg raise on the right, diminished sensation in the right L5 and S1 distribution, and spasm of the lumbar paraspinal musculature. Current plan of care includes to continue conservative care. The Request for Authorization requested service to include Hydrocodone 10/325mg twice per day as needed #60 (prescribed 9/21/15), Retrospective; Pantoprazole 20mg 3 times per day #90 (dispensed 9/21/15), and Retrospective; Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg 3 times per day as needed #90 (dispensed 9/21/15). The Utilization Review on 10-19-15 denied the request for Hydrocodone 10/325mg twice per day as needed #60 (prescribed 9/21/15), Retrospective; Pantoprazole 20mg 3 times per day #90 (dispensed 9/21/15), and Retrospective; Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg 3 times per day as needed #90 (dispensed 9/21/15).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hydrocodone 10/325mg twice per day as needed #60 (prescribed 9/21/15): 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 (Classification), Opioids, California Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) [DWC], Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids for neuropathic pain, Opioids for osteoarthritis, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain, Opioids, dealing with misuse & addiction, Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction, Opioids, dosing, Opioids, indicators for addiction, Opioids, long-term assessment. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute and Chronic), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Shoulder, Pain, Opioids.

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck, low back, and shoulder pain "except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that "ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Additionally, medical documents indicate that the patient has been on hydrocodone in excess of the recommended 2-week limit. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective; Pantoprazole 20mg 3 times per day #90 (dispensed 9/21/15): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

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), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: Protonix is the brand name version of Pantoprazole, which is a proton pump inhibitor. MTUS states, "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (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)." And "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 mg 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)." ODG states, "If a PPI is used, omeprazole OTC tablets or lansoprazole 24HR OTC are recommended for an equivalent clinical efficacy and significant cost savings. 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 is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)" The patient does not meet the age recommendations for increased GI risk. The medical documents provided establish the patient has experienced GI discomfort, but is nonspecific and does not indicate history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation. Medical records do not indicate that the patient is on ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or high dose/multiple NSAID. Additionally per guidelines, Pantoprazole is considered second line therapy and the treating physician has not provided detailed documentation of a failed trial of omeprazole and/or lansoprazole. As such, the request for Pantoprazole is not medically necessary.

Retrospective; Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg 3 times per day as needed #90 (dispensed 9/21/15): 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): Chronic pain programs, early intervention, Chronic pain programs, intensity, Chronic pain programs, opioids, Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril®) and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines Up-to-date, Flexeril.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment states for Cyclobenzaprine, "Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy. . . The effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. (Browning, 2001) Treatment should be brief." The medical documents indicate that patient is far in excess of the initial treatment window and period. Additionally, MTUS outlines, "Relief of pain with the use of medications is generally temporary, and measures of the lasting benefit from this modality should include evaluating the effect of pain relief in relationship to improvements in function and increased activity. Before prescribing any medication for pain, the following should occur: (1) determine the aim of use of the medication; (2) determine the potential benefits and adverse effects; (3) determine the patient's preference. Only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be

recorded. (Mens, 2005)" Up-to-date "flexeril" also recommends, "Do not use longer than 2-3 weeks". Medical documents do not fully detail the components outlined in the guidelines above and do not establish the need for long term/chronic usage of cyclobenzaprine. ODG states regarding cyclobenzaprine, "Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy . . . The addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended." Several other pain medications are being requested, along with cyclobenzaprine, which ODG recommends against. As such, the request is not medically necessary.