

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0057259 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 04/02/2015 | Date of Injury: | 03/17/2014 |
| Decision Date: | 06/04/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 02/26/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 03/25/2015 |

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: Arizona, Michigan

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 64 year old female who sustained a work related injury March 17, 2014. While performing her job, she developed pain to her neck, back, mid-back, bilateral arms and elbows, bilateral wrists and hands as well as head. Past history included diabetes, hypertension, and depression. According to the most recent primary treating physician's initial pain management consultation, dated November 12, 2014, the injured worker presented with pain to the cervical spine and upper extremities with tenderness to palpation and increased muscle rigidity. There are numerous trigger points palpable and tender throughout the cervical paraspinal muscles. Assessment included cervical myoligamentous injury with upper extremity radicular symptoms; cervicogenic headaches, reactionary depression/anxiety, medication-induced gastritis; lumbar myoligamentous injury; upper extremity overused syndrome. Treatment plan included administration of four trigger point injections, left posterior cervical and trapezius musculature, dispensed Anaprox DS and Prilosec, prescribed Lidoderm patch and Norco, and requesting acupuncture, cervical MRI and EMG (electrodiagnostic studies) upper extremity.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325 mg, sixty count: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78 and 124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96 (78,89,95).

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, opioids should be discontinued if there is no overall improvement in function, unless there are extenuating circumstances, Opioids should be continued if the patient has returned to work or has improved functioning and pain. Ongoing management actions should include prescriptions from a single practitioner, taken as directed and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. Documentation should follow the 4 A's of analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors. Long-term users of opioids should be regularly reassessed. In the maintenance phase, the dose should not be lowered if it is working. Also, patients who receive opioid therapy may sometimes develop unexpected changes in their response to opioids, which includes development of abnormal pain, change in pain pattern, persistence of pain at higher levels than expected. When this happens, opioids can actually increase rather than decrease sensitivity to noxious stimuli. It is important to note that a decrease in opioid efficacy should not always be treated by increasing the dose or adding other opioids, but may actually require weaning. A review of the injured workers medical records revealed that she had seen multiple providers and there was no documentation of if she had previously been prescribed opioids and if there was pain and functional improvement according to MTUS guideline recommendation for use of opioids and without this information, the request is not medically necessary.

Anaprox DS 550 mg, sixty count: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 67.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID's Page(s): 67-68.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, NSAIDs are 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. A review of the injured workers medical records that are

available to me reveal subjective and objective documentation of the injured workers pain and the use of an NSAID would be appropriate in the injured worker, therefore the request for Anaprox DS 550 mg, sixty count is medically necessary.

Prilosec 20 mg, sixty count: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) / Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs).

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS, Clinicians should weigh the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors according to specific criteria listed in the MTUS and a selection should be made based on these criteria 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). Per the ODG, PPI's are Recommended for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events. Prilosec (omeprazole), Prevacid (lansoprazole) and Nexium (esomeprazole magnesium) are PPIs. Healing doses of PPIs are more effective than all other therapies, although there is an increase in overall adverse effects compared to placebo. Nexium and Prilosec are very similar molecules. (Donnellan, 2010) In this RCT omeprazole provided a statistically significantly greater acid control than lansoprazole. (Miner, 2010) In general, the use of a PPI should be limited to the recognized indications and used at the lowest dose for the shortest possible amount of time. PPIs are highly effective for their approved indications, including preventing gastric ulcers induced by NSAIDs. Studies suggest, however, that nearly half of all PPI prescriptions are used for unapproved indications or no indications at all. Many prescribers believe that this class of drugs is innocuous, but much information is available to demonstrate otherwise. 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 had been recommended before prescription Nexium therapy (before it went OTC). The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011). A review of the injured workers medical records that are available to me reveal a past history of medication induced gastritis, therefore the request for Prilosec 20 mg, sixty count is medically necessary.

Ultracet 37.5/325 mg, sixty count: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78 and 124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Tramadol (Ultram) Page(s): 74-96, 113.

Decision rationale: The MTUS states that Tramadol is a centrally acting synthetic opioid analgesic and it is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic. Opioids are recommended for chronic pain, especially neuropathic pain that has not responded to first line recommendations like antidepressants and anticonvulsants. Long term users should be reassessed per specific guideline recommendations and the dose should not be lowered if it is working. Per the MTUS, Tramadol is indicated for moderate to severe pain. A review of the injured workers medical records revealed that she had seen multiple providers and there was no documentation of if she had previously been prescribed opioids and if there was pain and functional improvement according to MTUS guideline recommendation for use of opioids and without this information, the request is not medically necessary.