

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0050606 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 03/24/2015 | Date of Injury: | 02/04/2013 |
| Decision Date: | 05/01/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 02/20/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 03/17/2015 |

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: New York, Tennessee
 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 70 year old female injured worker suffered an industrial injury on 02/04/2013. The diagnoses were cervical radiculitis, cervical radiculopathy, lumbar radiculopathy, chronic pain, and bilateral carpal tunnel release. The diagnostics included cervical and brain magnetic resonance imaging. The injured worker had been treated with acupuncture, home exercise program, medications and physical therapy. On 1/28/2015 the treating provider reported neck and low back pain that radiates to the right upper extremity and bilateral lower extremities. The pain radiated to the right shoulder, forearm and hand along with numbness and muscles spasms rated at 6/10 with medications and without 8/10 without medications. The treatment plan included Cervical epidural, Omeprazole, and Orphenadrine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Cervical epidural C4-6: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain Interventions and Guidelines Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: Epidural steroid injections are recommended as an option for treatment of radicular pain (defined as pain in dermatomal distribution with corroborative findings of radiculopathy). Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. Epidural steroid injection can offer short term pain relief and use should be in conjunction with other rehab efforts, including continuing a home exercise program. There is little information on improved function. The American Academy of Neurology recently concluded that epidural steroid injections may lead to an improvement in radicular lumbosacral pain between 2 and 6 weeks following the injection, but they do not affect impairment of function or the need for surgery and do not provide long-term pain relief beyond 3 months, and there is insufficient evidence to make any recommendation for the use of epidural steroid injections to treat radicular cervical pain. In this case the diagnosis of radiculopathy is not supported by the documentation in the medical record and there is no corroboration by imaging or electrodiagnostic studies. Criteria for epidural steroid injections have not been met. The request is not medically necessary.

Omeprazole DR 20mg one QD #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain Interventions and Guidelines Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: Omeprazole is a proton pump inhibitor (PPI). PPIs are used in the treatment of peptic ulcer disease and may be prescribed in patients who are using non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and are at high risk for gastrointestinal events. Risk factors for high-risk events are age greater than 65, history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation, concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant, or high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). The patient in this case was using NSAID medication, but did not have any of the risk factors for a gastrointestinal event. The request is not medically necessary.

Orphenadrine ER 100mg one BID #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain Interventions and Guidelines Page(s): 63, 65.

Decision rationale: Orphenadrine is a muscle relaxant. It is similar to diphenhydramine, but has greater anticholinergic effects. Effects are thought to be secondary to analgesic and anticholinergic properties. Side effects are primarily anticholinergic and include drowsiness, urinary retention, and dry mouth. Side effects may limit use in the elderly. This medication has

been reported in case studies to be abused for euphoria and to have mood elevating effects. Non-sedating muscle relaxants are recommended with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment (less than two weeks) of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. These drugs should be used with caution in patients driving motor vehicles or operating heavy machinery. In this case the patient had been using orphenadrine since at least December 2014. The duration of treatment surpasses the recommended short-term duration of two weeks. The request is not medically necessary.