

Case Number:	CM14-0146748		
Date Assigned:	09/12/2014	Date of Injury:	01/28/1998
Decision Date:	10/15/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/28/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/09/2014

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 Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture & 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:

The injured worker is a 65 y/o female with date of injury 1/28/98 with related low back pain. Per progress report dated 8/11/14, the injured worker complained of constant pain in the low back that radiated into the lower extremities. The pain was rated at 5/10 in intensity. There was also intermittent right ankle pain. Per physical exam of the lumbar spine, paravertebral muscle tenderness, spasm, guarding and decreased standing flexion and extension were noted. Examination of the right ankle revealed tenderness and hypersensitivity with a positive Tinel's test at the right fibular head. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medication management. The date of UR decision was 8/28/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Fenoprofen Calcium (Nalfon) 400mg, every 12 hours, #120: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 11, 67-68.

Decision rationale: Current guidelines note that evidence is limited to make an initial recommendation with acetaminophen, and that NSAIDs may be more efficacious for treatment.

In terms of treatment of the hand it should be noted that there are no placebo trials of efficacy and recommendations have been extrapolated from other joints. The selection of acetaminophen as a first-line treatment appears to be made primarily based on side effect profile in osteoarthritis guidelines. The most recent Cochrane review on this subject suggests that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) are more efficacious for osteoarthritis in terms of pain reduction, global assessments and improvement of functional status. Fenoprofen Calcium is indicated for the injured worker's low back and right ankle pain. I respectfully disagree with the UR physician, the MTUS does not mandate documentation of functional improvement for the use of NSAIDs. The request is medically necessary.

Omeprazole 20mg, every 12 hours as needed, #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS, GI Symptoms & Cardiovascular Risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS, GI Symptoms & Cardiovascular Risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of proton pump inhibitors in conjunction with NSAIDs in situations in which the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events including: (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). CPMTG guidelines further specify: "Recommendations: Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g, ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.) Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease :(1) a non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg Omeprazole daily) or Misoprostol (200 four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. Patients at high risk of gastrointestinal events with cardiovascular disease: If GI risk is high the suggestion is for a low-dose Cox-2 plus low dose Aspirin (for cardioprotection) and a PPI. If cardiovascular risk is greater than GI risk the suggestion is Naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. (Laine, 2006) (Scholmerich, 2006) (Nielsen, 2006) (Chan, 2004) (Gold, 2007) (Laine, 2007)"As there is no documentation of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation, or cardiovascular disease in the records available for my review, the injured worker's risk for gastrointestinal events is low, as such, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Ondansetron 8mg ODT, as needed, #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 (ODG-TWC), Pain Procedure Summary (updated 07/10/14), Antiemetics

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS is silent on the use of Ondansetron. With regard to antiemetics, the ODG states "Not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Recommended for acute use as noted below per FDA-approved indications." Specifically, "Ondansetron (Zofran): This drug is a serotonin 5-HT₃ receptor antagonist. It is FDA-approved for nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment. It is also FDA-approved for postoperative use. Acute use is FDA-approved for gastroenteritis." As the injured worker is not postoperative or experiencing nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment, or gastroenteritis, Ondansetron is not recommended. There was no documentation suggesting the ongoing necessity of the medication or its efficacy. The request is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride 7.5mg, every 8 hours as needed, #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG-TWC), Pain Procedure Summary (last updated 07/10/14), Non-Sedating Muscle Relaxants

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63-64.

Decision rationale: With regard to muscle relaxants, the MTUS CPMTG states: "Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) 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." Regarding Cyclobenzaprine: "Recommended for a short course of therapy. Limited, mixed-evidence does not allow for a recommendation for chronic use. Cyclobenzaprine is a skeletal muscle relaxant and a central nervous system depressant with similar effects to tricyclic antidepressants (e.g. amitriptyline). Cyclobenzaprine is more effective than placebo in the management of back pain, although the effect is modest and comes at the price of adverse effects." The patient is not being treated for an acute exacerbation of chronic back pain. The documentation submitted for review does not specify how long the injured worker has been using this medication. For these reasons, the requested treatment is not medically necessary. It should be noted that the UR physician has certified a modification of this request for the purpose of weaning.