

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM14-0148272 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 09/18/2014 | Date of Injury: | 01/11/2009 |
| Decision Date: | 11/14/2014 | UR Denial Date: | 08/11/2014 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 09/11/2014 |

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 Anesthesiology, 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:

58y/o female injured worker with date of injury 1/11/09 with related back pain. Per progress report dated 7/21/14, the injured worker complained of aching pain in the low back rated 5-6/10, cramping pain in the left leg rated 5-6/10, stabbing pain in the ankle, numbness from the ankle into the foot, and symptoms of anxiety and depression. Per physical exam, decreased range of motion of the lumbar spine, tenderness to palpation in the lumbar paraspinal muscles, positive straight leg raise on the left, decreased L4, L5, and S1 dermatome sensation to pinprick and light touch, and decreased strength of the left tibialis anterior, extensor hallucis longus, inversion, plantar flexion, and eversion were noted. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, acupuncture, and medication management. The date of UR decision was 8/11/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MED RX Omeprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk, Page(s): 68-69.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: In the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy, the MTUS recommends stopping the NSAID, switching to a different NSAID, or considering the use of an H2-receptor antagonist or a PPI. 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 (200g 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 naproxen 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. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

MED RX, Tramadol ER (extended release) 150mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use Page(s): 76-80.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: Pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4s' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs." "Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of tramadol or any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior

(e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. UDS dated 5/2014 was noted to be consistent with prescribed medications. However, as MTUS recommends discontinuing opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

MED RX, Hydrocodone/APAP 100/325mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, specific drug list Page(s): 91-94.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 91.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: Pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4s' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any aberrant drug-taking behaviors).The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs."Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Norco or any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. UDS dated 5/2014 was noted to be consistent with prescribed medications. However, as MTUS recommends discontinuing opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.