

Case Number:	CM15-0047117		
Date Assigned:	03/19/2015	Date of Injury:	06/17/2003
Decision Date:	04/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/12/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 59 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 6/17/03. The diagnoses have included left ulnar neuropathy, persistent cervical radiculitis, persistent left median and ulnar neuropathy of the wrist, and post injury depression. Surgery included status post bilateral shoulder subacromial decompressions, status post re-do right shoulder surgery with residual tendinopathy and brachial plexitis, status post bilateral carpal tunnel and ulnar nerve decompressions, status post bilateral surgery for lateral epicondylitis, status post re-do decompression of the left ulnar at the wrist and elbow with modification of the submuscular transposition. Treatment to date has included medications, surgery, bracing, diagnostics and Home Exercise Program (HEP). Currently, as per the physician progress note dated 3/2/15, the injured worker complains of neck pain that radiates to both upper extremities and above both ears causing constant sharp headaches. She also has pain, weakness, numbness and tingling involving the left hand and upper extremity. The current medications included Voltaren, Protonix, Ultracet, Effexor XR, Lortab and Neurontin. The (EMG) electromyography studies dated 8/13/14 revealed evidence of left ulnar neuropathy at the wrist and left median neuropathy at the wrist. The physician's exam revealed persistent paracervical tenderness both sides and Spurling sign was associated with dysesthesias that extend to both arms. There was tenderness noted over the ulnar nerve and pressure provocative testing over Guyon's canal was positive. The dysesthesias were present and involved the ring and small fingers on the left hand and Tinel and Phalen signs were positive over the carpal tunnel of the left wrist. It was noted that the injured worker depends on the medications to stabilize her symptoms to a degree that she is able to carry

out basic activities of daily living (ADL's). The physician's request was for Prilosec 20mg #30, Lyrica 100mg #60 and Percocet 5/325mg #40.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Prilosec 20mg #30: 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 Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Recommend with precautions as indicated below. Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. 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). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastro duodenal lesions. Recommendations Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g, ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.)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 g 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). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. There is no documentation provided that places this patient at intermediate or high risk that would justify the use of a PPI. There is no mention of current gastrointestinal or cardiovascular disease The patient has previous gastritis with NSAID therapy. For these reasons the criteria set forth above per the California MTUS for the use of this medication has not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Lyrica 100mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lyrica Page(s): 20.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on Lyrica states: Pregabalin (Lyrica, no generic available) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. This medication is designated as a Schedule V controlled substance because

of its causal relationship with euphoria. (Blommel, 2007) This medication also has an anti-anxiety effect. The patient does not have either of the indicated conditions and therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Percocet 5/325mg #40: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: 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. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to nonopioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids: (a) If the patient has returned to work; (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox- AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004). The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented

improvement in VAS scores. There are also no objective measurements of improvement in function. Therefore criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.