MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0119056		
Date Assigned:	06/29/2015	Date of Injury:	02/18/2003
Decision Date:	09/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/19/2015

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: Indiana
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 Injured worker is a 56-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 02/18/03. Initial complaints and diagnoses are not available. Treatments to date include left shoulder surgery and medications. Diagnostic studies MRIs of the neck and shoulder, as well as nerve conduction studies. Current complaints include pain in both knees, neck, left shoulder and low back. Current diagnoses include cervical sprain and facet inflammation and radiculitis, impingement and prominence along the inferior aspect of the acromioclavicular joint, left epicondylitis, carpal tunnel syndrome on the left, discogenic lumbar condition, chronic pain syndrome, and surge of right wrist pain from use of cane. In a progress note dated 05/08/15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as medications including Norco, Topamax, Tramadol, and Protonix, as well as a MRI of the cervical and lumbar spine. The requested treatments include medications including Norco, Topamax, Topiramate, Tramadol, and Protonix, as well as a MRI of the cervical and lumbar spine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI of the cervical spine without contrast: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): s 177-8.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 177-182. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back, Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

Decision rationale: ACOEM states, "Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag, Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction, Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery and Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. " ODG states, "Not recommended except for indications list below. Patients who are alert, have never lost consciousness, are not under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, have no distracting injuries, have no cervical tenderness, and have no neurologic findings, do not need imaging. " Indications for imaging MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) are: Chronic neck pain (after 3 months conservative treatment), radiographs normal, neurologic signs or symptoms present, Neck pain with radiculopathy if severe or progressive neurologic deficit, chronic neck pain, radiographs show spondylosis, neurologic signs or symptoms present, Chronic neck pain, radiographs show old trauma, neurologic signs or symptoms present, Chronic neck pain, radiographs show bone or disc margin destruction, Suspected cervical spine trauma, neck pain, clinical findings suggest ligamentous injury (sprain), radiographs and/or CT "normal", Known cervical spine trauma: equivocal or positive plain films with neurological deficit, Upper back/thoracic spine trauma with neurological deficit." The treating physician has not provided evidence of red flags to meet the criteria above. As, such the request for MRI or the cervical spine is not medically necessary.

MRI of the lumbar spine without contrast: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back, Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: MTUS and ACOEM recommend MRI, in general, for low back pain when, "cuada equine, tumor, infection, or fracture are strongly suspected and plain film radiographs are negative, MRI test of choice for patients with prior back surgery." ACOEM additionally recommends against MRI for low back pain before 1 month in absence of red flags." ODG states, "Imaging is indicated only if they have severe progressive neurologic impairments or signs or symptoms indicating a serious or specific underlying condition, or if they are candidates for invasive interventions. Immediate imaging is recommended for patients with major risk factors for cancer, spinal infection, cauda equina syndrome, or severe or progressive neurologic deficits. Imaging after a trial of treatment is recommended for patients who have minor risk factors for cancer, inflammatory back disease, vertebral compression fracture, radiculopathy, or symptomatic spinal stenosis. Subsequent imaging should be based on new symptoms or changes in current symptoms." The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam, objective testing, or subjective complaints) any red flags, significant worsening in symptoms or other findings suggestive of the pathologies outlined in the above guidelines. As such, the request for MRI lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Topamax 50mg #60: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Topamax is the brand name version of Topiramate, which is an anti-epileptic medication. MTUS states that anti-epilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain, but do specify with caveats by medication. MTUS states regarding Topamax, "has been shown to have variable efficacy, with failure to demonstrate efficacy in neuropathic pain of "central" etiology. It is still considered for use for neuropathic pain when other anticonvulsants fail. Topiramate has recently been investigated as an adjunct treatment for obesity, but the side effect profile limits its use in this regard." Medical files do not indicate the failure of other first line anticonvulsants, such as gabapentin. As such, the request for Topamax is not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Topiramate (Topamax) 50mg #60: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: Topamax is the brand name version of Topiramate, which is an anti-epileptic medication. MTUS states that anti-epilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain, but do specify with caveats by medication. MTUS states regarding Topamax, "has been shown to have variable efficacy, with failure to demonstrate efficacy in neuropathic pain of "central" etiology. It is still considered for use for neuropathic pain when other anticonvulsants fail. Topiramate has recently been investigated as an adjunct treatment for obesity, but the side effect profile limits its use in this regard." Medical files do not indicate the failure of other first line anticonvulsants, such as gabapentin. As such, the request for Topamax is not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Tramadol (Ultram ER) 150mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol; opioids Page(s): 74-123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®).

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of Tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that, "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid

analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/ acetaminophen." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Pantoprazole (Protonix) 20mg #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 risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: Protonix is the brand name version of Pantoprazole, which is a proton pump inhibitor. MTUS states, "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events are: (1) age over 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); and "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 g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (over a 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1. 44)." ODG states, "If a PPI is used, Omeprazole OTC tablets or Lansoprazole 24HR OTC are recommended for an equivalent clinical efficacy and significant cost savings. Products in this drug class have demonstrated equivalent clinical efficacy and safety at comparable doses, including Esomeprazole (Nexium), Lansoprazole (Prevacid), Omeprazole (Prilosec), Pantoprazole (Protonix), Dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and Rabeprazole (Aciphex), (Shi, 2008). A trial of Omeprazole or Lansoprazole is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)" The patient does not meet the age recommendations for increased GI risk. The medical documents provided establish the patient has experienced GI discomfort, but is nonspecific and does not indicate history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation. Medical records do not indicate that the patient is on ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or high dose/multiple NSAID. Additionally per guidelines, Pantoprazole is considered second line therapy and the treating physician has not provided detailed documentation of a failed trial of Omeprazole and/or Lansoprazole. As such, the request is not medically necessary.