

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0087076 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 05/11/2015 | Date of Injury: | 07/31/2009 |
| Decision Date: | 09/15/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 04/08/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 05/06/2015 |

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 59 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on July 31, 2009, incurring back injuries from a motor vehicle accident. He was diagnosed with lumbar disc disease and cervical strain with radiculitis, and left shoulder impingement. Treatment included physical therapy and medication management. He underwent a lumbar fusion in 2010, 2011 and 2013, and left shoulder arthroscopy in 2011. Electromyography studies revealed radiculopathy. Currently, the injured worker complained of dull pain of the neck with weakness and loss of grip strength. He had limited range of motion, constant stiffness pain from walking and difficulty sleeping. He complained of low back pain radiating into the buttocks, hips, thighs, knees feet and toes. He uses a cane and walker for mobility. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included prescriptions for Celebrex, Lidoderm patch, Nexium, OxyContin, Voltaren Gel and Oxycodone IR.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Celebrex 200mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 22 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of Celebrex. This medication is in the category of a COX-2 inhibitor anti-inflammatory medication. The MTUS guidelines state the following regarding its use: COX-2 inhibitors (e.g., Celebrex) may be considered if the patient has a risk of GI complications, but not for the majority of patients. Generic NSAIDs and COX-2 inhibitors have similar efficacy and risks when used for less than 3 months, but a 10-to-1 difference in cost. (Rate of overall GI bleeding is 3% with COX-2s versus 4.5% with ibuprofen.) In this case, celebrex is not indicated. There is inadequate documentation of a significant gastrointestinal risk which would justify its use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Lidoderm patch 5%: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 56-57 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a Lidoderm patch to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that its use is indicated for post herpetic neuralgia after an initial trial of an anti-epileptic medication. Further research is needed to recommend use for chronic neuropathic disorders besides post-herpetic neuralgia. In this case, the patient does not have a diagnosis documented which would justify the use of Lidoderm patches. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Nexium 20mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of a proton pump inhibitor. This is usually given as an acid reducing medication 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. Unfortunately, they do have certain side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically. 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 anti-coagulant; 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 medically necessary.

Oxycontin: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 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 medically necessary.

Voltaren gel 2-4gms, four times daily #100gm, #5 per month: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of Voltaren gel for topical use to aid in pain relief. This medication would be classified as an NSAID and aids in inflammation reduction. Qualifying factors for this product is indicated by the following per the guidelines: 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 stated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of a topical NSAID. This is based on the diagnosis and treatment duration. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Oxycodone IR: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 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 medically necessary.