

Case Number:	CM14-0215933		
Date Assigned:	01/06/2015	Date of Injury:	08/11/2013
Decision Date:	03/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/15/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/23/2014

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. 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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 patient is a 41-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on August 11, 2013. Subsequently, the patient developed chronic low back pain. Prior treatments included: medications, physical therapy (x24), TENS, back support, and LESI. According to the progress report dated December 4, 2014, the patient complained of constant low back pain. The pain radiates down the bilateral lower extremities, left greater than right. The pain radiates to the bilateral toes. The patient described the pain as sharp and severe. She rated the level of her pain as an 8/10 with medications and 10/10 without medications. The patient complained of frequent muscle spasms in the low back bilaterally. The patient reported worsening of her pain since last visit. The patient also reported constipation as moderate. Examination of the lumbar spine revealed spasm at L4-S1 in the left paraspinal musculature. Tenderness was noted upon palpation in the spinal vertebral area L4-S1 levels. The range of motion of the lumbar spine was severely limited secondary to pain. Pain was significantly increased with flexion and extension. Facet signs were present in the lumbar spine bilaterally. Sensory exam showed decreased sensitivity to pinpoint along the L4-S1 dermatome in the left lower extremity. Motor examination showed moderate decreased strength in the left lower extremity. Straight leg raise with the patient in the seated position was positive bilaterally at 45 degrees. The patient was diagnosed with chronic pain, lumbar disc displacement, lumbar facet arthropathy, lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar spinal stenosis, anxiety, depression, and morbid obesity.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Home Care Assistance Evaluation for 5 Days Per Week: 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)

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Home health services Page(s): 51.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, home care assistance is recommended only for otherwise recommended medical treatment for patients who are homebound, on a part-time or intermittent basis, generally up to no more than 35 hours per week. Medical treatment does not include homemaker services like shopping, cleaning, and laundry, and personal care given by home health aides like bathing, dressing, and using the bathroom when this is the only care needed (CMS, 2004). The patient does not fulfill the requirements mentioned above. There is no documentation that the patient recommended medical treatment requires home health aide.

Naproxen 550 MG #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NON SELECTIVE NSAIDS Page(s): 72.

Decision rationale: Naproxen (Naprosyn): delayed release (EC-Naprosyn), as Sodium salt (Anaprox, Anaprox DS, Aleve OTC) Generic available; extended-release (Naprelan): 375 mg. Different dose strengths and formulations of the drug are not necessarily bioequivalent. Dosing Information: Osteoarthritis or ankylosing spondylitis: Dividing the daily dose into 3 doses versus 2 doses for immediate-release and delayed-release formulations generally does not affect response. Morning and evening doses do not have to be equal in size. The dose may be increased to 1500 mg/day of naproxyn for limited periods when a higher level of analgesic/anti-inflammatory activity is required (for up to 6 months). Naprosyn or naproxyn: 250-500 mg PO twice daily. Anaprox: 275-550 mg PO twice daily. (total dose may be increased to 1650 mg a day for limited periods). EC-Naprosyn: 375 mg or 500 mg twice daily. The tablet should not be broken, crushed or chewed to maintain integrity of the enteric coating. Naprelan: Two 375 mg tablets (750 mg) PO once daily or two 500 mg tablets (1000 mg) once daily. If required (and a lower dose was tolerated) Naprelan can be increased to 1500 mg once daily for limited periods (when higher analgesia is required). Pain: Naprosyn or naproxyn: 250-500 mg PO twice daily. The maximum dose on day one should not exceed 1250 mg and 1000 mg on subsequent days. Anaprox: 275-550 mg PO twice daily. The maximum dose on day one should not exceed 1375 mg and 1100 mg on subsequent days. Extended-release Naprelan: Not recommended due to delay in absorption (Naprelan Package Insert). There is no documentation of the rationale behind the long-term use of Naproxen. NSAID should be used for the shortest duration and the lowest dose. There is no documentation from the patient file that the provider titrated Naproxen to the

lowest effective dose and used it for the shortest period possible. Naproxen was used without clear documentation of its efficacy. Furthermore, there is no documentation that the provider followed the patient for NSAID adverse reactions that are not limited to GI side effect, but also may affect the renal function.

Omeprazole DR 20 MG #60: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events . The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (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). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events.

Tizanidine 2 MG #60: 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)

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, a non sedating muscle relaxant is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic lumbosacral pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. Tizanidine was used in this patient without clear evidence of spasm or objective monitoring of the drug effect on the patient condition. The patient in this case does not have clear evidence of spasm and the prolonged use of Tizanidine is not justified.

Tramadol ER 150 MG #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 113.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram (Tramadol) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules:(a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy.(b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function.(c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. 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 non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. Although, Tramadol may be needed to help with the patient pain, there is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement from its previous use. The patient stated he has minimal relief with his medications (Tramadol ER and anaprox). There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of tramadol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medications.

Gabapentin 300 MG #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines
Gabapentin Page(s): 49.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Gabapentin is an anti-epilepsy drug (AEDs - also referred to as anti-convulsants), which has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain. There is no clear evidence that the patient has a neuropathic pain. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Gabapentin is effective in back pain.