MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0018402		
Date Assigned:	02/06/2015	Date of Injury:	03/07/2001
Decision Date:	03/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/30/2015

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: Massachusetts
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 45 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 3/07/2001 when she slipped and fell while exiting a bus, injuring her left neck and left shoulder. The diagnoses have included post cervical laminectomy syndrome, cervical pain, carpal tunnel syndrome, brachial neuritis or radiculitis and anxiety. Treatment to date has included surgical intervention including a cervical spine fusion (2008), extension to the fusion C4-C7 (2012) and extension of the fusion to C3-C7 (5/14/2014). Treatment has also included acupuncture, physical therapy, TENS unit, medications and activity modification. Currently, the IW complains of ongoing neck pain rated as 5/10 with radiation into the arms. Pain has increased since the last visit. The pain is described as burning and stabbing. Spurling's maneuver causes pain radiating to the upper extremity. On 1/30/2015, Utilization Review non-certified a request for Prilosec 20mg, urine drug screening and transdermal compound medication, noting that the clinical information submitted for review fails to meet the evidence based guidelines for the requested service. The MTUS was cited. On 1/30/2015, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of Prilosec 20mg, urine drug screening and transdermal compound medication.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Transdermal Compounded Medication DOS 01/05/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

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

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS, there is little to no research to support the use of topical compounded creams. The use of these compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. Topical analgesics are largely experimental and there are a few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

Prilosec 20mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 68.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines PPI, Page(s): p68-69.

Decision rationale: The MTUS makes the following recommendations for the use of proton pump inhibitors. Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (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.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 omeprazoledaily) or misoprostol (200 g 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. Cardiovascular disease: A non-pharmacological choice should be the first option in patients with cardiac risk factors. It is then suggested that acetaminophen or aspirin be used for short term needs. An opioid also remains a short-term alternative for analgesia. Major risk factors (recent MI, or coronary artery surgery, including recent stent placement): If NSAID therapy is necessary, the suggested treatment is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. Mild to moderate risk factors: If long-term or high-dose therapy is required, full-dose naproxen (500 mg twice a day) appears to be the preferred choice of NSAID. If naproxyn is ineffective, the suggested treatment is (1) the addition of aspirin to naproxyn plus

a PPI, or (2) a low-dose Cox-2 plus ASA. According to the records available for review the patient does not meet any of the guidelines required for the use of this medication therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

Urine Drug Screening DOS 01/05/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing Page(s): 43.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Urine Drug Test

Decision rationale: Criteria for Use of Urine Drug TestingUrine drug tests may be subject to specific drug screening statutes and regulations based on state and local laws, and the requesting clinician should be familiar with these. State regulations may address issues such as chain of custody requirements, patient privacy, and how results may be used or shared with employers. The rules and best practices of the U.S. Department of Transportation should be consulted if there is doubt about the legally defensible framework of most jurisdictions. (DOT, 2010)Criteria 1-19 as outlined in ODG section.According to the documents available for review, the patient meets none of the aforementioned MTUS criteria for the use of urine drug testing. Therefore at this time the requirements for treatment have not been met, and medical necessity has not been established.