

Case Number:	CM15-0040803		
Date Assigned:	03/11/2015	Date of Injury:	06/12/2013
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/04/2015

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: Pennsylvania
 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:

This is a 39 year-old female who has reported neck, shoulder, low back, and knee pain after an injury on 6/12/13. The diagnoses have included cervicgia, cervical strain, shoulder strain, lumbar strain, and knee derangement. Reports from the current primary treating physician during 2013 to January 2015 are of widespread pain. Unspecified 'medications' are reported to help pain and sleep. There are no reports which discuss the specific results of using any medication or which discuss the patient-specific indications for any medication. The current medications appear to have been prescribed since at least 2013, since the initial visit in August 2013. Other treatments listed in the reports include injections, physical therapy, and shockwave therapy. Per the report of 1/5/15, there was ongoing multifocal pain. Unspecified medications were reported to provide non-specific pain relief and better sleep. The medications now under Independent Medical Review were continued. On 2/25/15, Utilization Review non-certified the medications now under Independent Medical Review. The decision were based on lack of clear indications and non-compliance with the guidelines. The MTUS and drugs.com were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ketoprofen 20% cream, 167 grams: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Medications Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The request does not contain directions for use. Per the MTUS, topical NSAIDs are only for use on the extremities and only for short durations. It is not clear in this case that use is for the extremities only. Use to date has been long term. Note that topical ketoprofen is not FDA approved, and is not recommended per the MTUS citation above. This topical agent is not medically necessary based on the MTUS.

Cyclobenzaprine 5% cream, 110 grams: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Medications Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS citation above, there is no good evidence in support of topical muscle relaxants; these agents are not recommended. In addition, two muscle relaxants were dispensed simultaneously (two forms of cyclobenzaprine), which is duplicative, unnecessary, and potentially toxic. This topical agent is not medically necessary based on the MTUS.

Synapryn 10mg/1ml oral suspension 500ml: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Glucosamine (and Chondroitin Sulfate); Tramadol (Ultram).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids; Glucosamine (and Chondroitin Sulfate) Page(s): 77-80; 50.

Decision rationale: Synapryn is tramadol with glucosamine in an oral suspension: The reason for combining these medications is not discussed in any physician report. Given that tramadol is generally a prn (as needed) medication to be used as little as possible, and that glucosamine (assuming a valid indication) is to be taken regularly regardless of acute symptoms, the combination product is illogical and not indicated. Tramadol is prescribed without clear evidence of the considerations and expectations found in the MTUS and similar guidelines. Opioids are minimally indicated, if at all, for chronic back pain. The prescribing physician does not specifically address function with respect to prescribing opioids, and does not address the other recommendations in the MTUS. There is no evidence that the treating physician has utilized a treatment plan NOT using opioids, and that the patient "has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics."The MTUS provides support for treating moderate arthritis pain, particularly knee osteoarthritis, with glucosamine sulphate. Other forms of glucosamine are not supported by good

medical evidence. The treating physician in this case has not provided evidence of the form of glucosamine in Synapryn, and that it is the form recommended in the MTUS and supported by the best medical evidence. The treating physician did not provide evidence for knee osteoarthritis. Should there be any indication for glucosamine in this case, it must be given as a single agent apart from other analgesics, particularly analgesics like tramadol which are habituating. Synapryn is not medically necessary based on the MTUS, lack of good medical evidence, and lack of a treatment plan for chronic opioid therapy consistent with the MTUS.

Tabradol 1mg/1ml oral suspension 250ml: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 63-66.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines cyclobenzaprine; Muscle relaxants Page(s): 41-42; 63-66.

Decision rationale: Tabradol is cyclobenzaprine in an oral suspension. The MTUS for Chronic Pain does not recommend muscle relaxants for chronic pain. Non-sedating muscle relaxants are an option for short term exacerbations of chronic low back pain. This patient has chronic pain with no evidence of prescribing for flare-ups. The MTUS states that treatment with cyclobenzaprine should be brief, and that the addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended. In this case, cyclobenzaprine is added to other agents, and the oral suspension form plus topical is experimental and unproven. Prescribing was not for a short term exacerbation. Multiple medications, including a topical muscle relaxant, were prescribed together without adequate trials of each. Per the MTUS, cyclobenzaprine is not indicated and is not medically necessary.

Deprizine 15mg/ml oral suspension 250ml: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Deprizine is ranitidine in an oral suspension. Ranitidine is prescribed without any patient-specific rationale provided. If ranitidine is prescribed as co-therapy with an NSAID, ranitidine is not the best drug. Note the MTUS recommendations cited. There are no medical reports which adequately describe the relevant signs and symptoms of possible GI disease. There is no examination of the abdomen on record. There are many possible etiologies for GI symptoms; the available reports do not provide adequate consideration of these possibilities. Empiric treatment after minimal evaluation is not indicated. Co-therapy with an NSAID is not indicated in patients other than those at high risk. No reports describe the specific risk factors present in this case. Ranitidine is not medically necessary based on the MTUS.

Dicopanol (diphenhydramine) 5mg/ml oral suspension 150ml: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain chapter, Insomnia.

Decision rationale: The treating physician has stated that Dicopanol is diphenhydramine and other unnamed ingredients. Medical necessity cannot be determined for unspecified compounds, and unpublished ingredients cannot be assumed to be safe or effective. Dicopanol is not medically necessary on this basis alone. In addition, Dicopanol is stated to be for insomnia. The MTUS does not address the use of hypnotics other than benzodiazepines. No physician reports describe the specific criteria for a sleep disorder. Treatment of a sleep disorder, including prescribing hypnotics, should not be initiated without a careful diagnosis. There is no evidence of that in this case. Note the Official Disability Guidelines citation above. That citation also states that antihistamines are not indicated for long term use as tolerance develops quickly, and that there are many, significant side effects. Dicopanol is not medically necessary based on lack of a sufficient analysis of the patient's condition, the ODG citation, and lack of information provided about the ingredients.

Fanatrex (Gabapentin) 25mg/ml oral suspension 420ml: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-Epilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-22.

Decision rationale: Fanatrex is stated to be a formulation of gabapentin. The treating physician has stated that it is for neuropathic pain. None of the physician reports adequately discuss the signs and symptoms diagnostic of neuropathic pain. There are no physician reports which adequately address the specific symptomatic and functional benefit from the antiepileptic drugs (AEDs) used to date. Note the criteria for a 'good' response per the MTUS. Gabapentin is a reproductive hazard and there is no evidence that the treating physician has discussed this with this reproductive age female. Gabapentin is not medically necessary based on the lack of any clear indication, the lack of significant symptomatic and functional benefit from its use to date, and the lack of evidence for informed consent to use a reproductive hazard.