

Case Number:	CM14-0102407		
Date Assigned:	09/16/2014	Date of Injury:	03/15/2012
Decision Date:	12/30/2014	UR Denial Date:	06/06/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/02/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This is a male patient with a date of injury of March 15, 2012. A utilization review determination dated June 6, 2014 recommends non-certification of ondansetron 8 mg ODT #30, orphenadrine citrate ER 100 mg, tramadol ER 150 mg #90, and Terocin patch #30. A progress note dated April 11, 2014 identifies subjective complaints of constant knee pain, cervical, and lumbar spine pain. The physical examination reveals tenderness at the cervical and lumbar spine with spasm, and positive SLR. The knee joint line reveals a well-heeled scar, decreased range of motion, and positive patella compression test. There are no diagnoses listed. The treatment plan recommends bilateral knee brace, follow up with other specialist, AME report is pending, and medications were prescribed.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ondansetron 8 mg ODT #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, Antiemetics

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for ondansetron 8mg ODT #30, California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) guidelines do not contain criteria regarding the use of antiemetic medication. Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) states that antiemetics are not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Guidelines go on to recommend that ondansetron is approved for postoperative use, nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy, and acute use for gastroenteritis. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has nausea as a result of any of these diagnoses. Additionally, there are no subjective complaints of nausea in any of the recent progress reports provided for review. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested ondansetron 8mg ODT #30 is not medically necessary.

Orphenadrine Citrate ER 100 mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for orphenadrine citrate ER 100mg, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the orphenadrine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested orphenadrine citrate ER 100mg is not medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150 mg #90: 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): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for tramadol ER 150mg #90, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Ultram is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately,

there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested tramadol ER 150mg #90 is not medically necessary.

Terocin Patch #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Terocin Patch #30, Terocin is a combination of methyl salicylate, menthol, lidocaine and capsaicin. Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended, is not recommended. Regarding the use of topical nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory, guidelines state that 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 1st 2 weeks of treatment osteoarthritis, but either not afterwards, or with the diminishing effect over another two-week period. Regarding use of capsaicin, guidelines state that it is recommended only as an option for patients who did not respond to or are intolerant to other treatments. Regarding the use of topical lidocaine, the guidelines state that it is recommended for localized peripheral pain after there is evidence of a trial of first-line therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient is unable to tolerate oral NSAIDs. Oral NSAIDs have significantly more guideline support compared with topical NSAIDs. Additionally, there is no indication that the topical NSAID is going to be used for short duration. Additionally, there is no documentation of localized peripheral pain with evidence of failure of first-line therapy as recommended by guidelines prior to the initiation of topical lidocaine. Finally, there is no indication that the patient has been intolerant to or did not respond to other treatments prior to the initiation of capsaicin therapy. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested Terocin Patch #30 is not medically necessary.