

Case Number:	CM15-0084318		
Date Assigned:	05/06/2015	Date of Injury:	07/21/2009
Decision Date:	09/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/01/2015

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: California

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 injured worker is a 57 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on July 21, 2009. The injured worker reported low back pain while lifting heavy boxes. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar intervertebral disc displacement, unspecified sleep disturbance, thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis and dysthymic disorder and reactive depression with chronic pain. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date have included surgery, topical and oral medication. A progress note dated February 2, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of neck, low back and leg pain. She reports poor sleep due to pain. Physical exam notes cervical left shoulder, thoracic and lumbar tenderness with decreased range of motion (ROM). The plan includes topical and oral medication and injections, psychiatry referral and lumbar support.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidocaine gel 5% topical bid to tid to affected site 1 tube: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 112 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of topical lidocaine. The MTUS guidelines state the following: Lidocaine Indication: Neuropathic pain: Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). Topical lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. Non-dermal patch formulations are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. Further research is needed to recommend this treatment for chronic neuropathic pain disorders other than post-herpetic neuralgia. In this case, as stated above, the patient does not meet the criteria for use of this product in this formulation. There is a requirement of documentation of a first-line therapy trial prior to use of a lidocaine dermal patch. As such, the request is not certified or medically necessary.

Phenergan 25mg qd: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disabilities guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Antiemetics (for opioid nausea).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of phenergan. This is a medication in the phenothiazine class and is usually used for nausea in certain circumstances. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue but the ODG state the following: Not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Recommended for acute use as noted below per FDA-approved indications. Nausea and vomiting is common with use of opioids. These side effects tend to diminish over days to weeks of continued exposure. Studies of opioid adverse effects including nausea and vomiting are limited to short-term duration (less than four weeks) and have limited application to long-term use. If nausea and vomiting remains prolonged, other etiologies of these symptoms should be evaluated for. The differential diagnosis includes gastroparesis (primarily due to diabetes). Current research for treatment of nausea and vomiting as related to opioid use primarily addresses the use of antiemetics in patients with cancer pain or those utilizing opioids for acute/postoperative therapy. Recommendations based on these studies cannot be extrapolated to chronic non-malignant pain patients. There is no high-quality literature to support any one treatment for opioid-induced nausea in chronic non-malignant pain patients. (Moore 2005) Promethazine (Phenergan): This drug is a phenothiazine. It is recommended as a sedative and antiemetic in pre-operative and post-operative situations. Multiple central nervous system effects are noted with use including somnolence, confusion and sedation. Tardive dyskinesia is also associated with use. This is characterized by involuntary movements of the tongue, mouth, jaw, and/or face. Choreoathetoid movements of the extremities can also occur. Development appears to be associated with prolonged treatment and in some cases can be irreversible. Anticholinergic effects can occur (dry mouth, dry eyes, urinary

retention and ileus). In this case, as indicated above, the patient does not qualify for the use of this medication. It is not indicated for use in patients who develop nausea or vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. As such, the request is not certified or medically necessary.

Ranitidine 150mg bid #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 68 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of an acid reducing medication. The guidelines do not specifically address or advise the use of an H2 blocker but does make recommendations regarding medications in the same category classified as proton pump inhibitors. This is usually given for patients with esophageal reflux, gastritis, or peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain which have side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically with a proton pump inhibitor or Misoprostol. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(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)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not certified or medically necessary.

Biofreeze apply as directed up to tid alternating with voltaren gel 5% 1 vial: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 111-112 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a topical NSAID for pain relief. There are specific criteria require for use based on the guidelines. The MTUS states the following: The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. FDA-approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac): Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine,

hip or shoulder. In this case, as indicated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of this medication based on the diagnosis and treatment duration. As such, the request is not certified or medically necessary.

Dilaudid 2mg 0.5tab qd #15: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 78 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the opioid class. The MTUS guidelines state that for ongoing treatment with a pharmaceutical in this class, certain requirements are necessary. This includes not only adequate pain control, but also functional improvement. Four domains have been proposed for management of patients on opioids. This includes pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. In this case, there is inadequate documentation of persistent functional improvement which should eventually lead to medication discontinuation. The records also do not reveal screening measures as discussed above for continued use of a medication in the opioid class. As such, the request is not certified or medically necessary.

Ambien 5mg 0.5tab qhs: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disabilities Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 15 Stress Related Conditions Page(s): 399.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a sleep aid. The need for this type of medication is varied and includes side effects of pharmaceuticals taken, stress, or even psychiatric conditions. Prior to use, a proper work-up is required delineating the etiology of the sleep disturbance. This may require a psychiatric evaluation. Further, restorative measures should initially include improving sleep hygiene, reducing caffeine intake and fat rich foods. In this case, the required evaluation and initial treatment measures are not seen. As such, the request is not certified or medically necessary.

Trigger point injections neck on prn basis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78-95.

Decision rationale: The request is for a trigger point injection to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Recommended only for myofascial pain syndrome as indicated below, with limited lasting value. Not recommended for radicular pain. Trigger point injections with an anesthetic such as Bupivacaine are recommended for non-resolving trigger points, but the addition of a corticosteroid is not generally recommended. Not recommended for radicular pain. Trigger point injections with a local anesthetic may be recommended for the treatment of chronic low back or neck pain with myofascial pain syndrome when all of the following criteria are met: (1) Documentation of circumscribed trigger points with evidence upon palpation of a twitch response as well as referred pain; (2) Symptoms have persisted for more than three months; (3) Medical management therapies such as ongoing stretching exercises, physical therapy, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants have failed to control pain; (4) Radiculopathy is not present (by exam, imaging, or neuro-testing); (5) Not more than 3-4 injections per session; (6) No repeat injections unless a greater than 50% pain relief is obtained for six weeks after an injection and there is documented evidence of functional improvement; (7) Frequency should not be at an interval less than two months; (8) Trigger point injections with any substance (e.g., saline or glucose) other than local anesthetic with or without steroid are not recommended. (Colorado, 2002) (BlueCross BlueShield, 2004). In this case, as stated above, the patient does not qualify for this treatment modality. Patients who have any radicular symptoms present on exam or imaging preclude trigger point injection. As such, the request is not certified or medically necessary.