

Case Number:	CM15-0170189		
Date Assigned:	09/10/2015	Date of Injury:	05/28/2015
Decision Date:	11/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/28/2015

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: California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency 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 55 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 05-28-2015. Mechanism of injury occurred performing his usual and customary work duties when he sustained injuries to his cervical spine, left shoulder left elbow and left wrist. Diagnoses include cervical spine sprain-strain with left sided radiculitis, impingement syndrome in the left shoulder, medial and lateral epicondylitis in the left elbow and left wrist and hand pain. Physician progress noted dated from 07-23-2015 documents the injured worker complains of neck, left shoulder, left elbow and left hand pain. There is tenderness over the left upper trapezius, cervical spine paravertebral muscles, left shoulder, elbow and wrist with decreased range of motion of the cervical spine and positive impingement sign of the left shoulder, and restricted left shoulder range of motion. Tinel's sign over the cubital tunnel is positive on the left elbow, along with a positive Cozen's and Mill's test. Tinel's sign and Phalen's sign are positive on the left wrist. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, and medications. Current medications include Naproxen and Gabapentin. The treatment plan includes an Electromyography and Nerve Conduction Velocity of the bilateral upper extremities, Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the cervical spine without contrast, Neurontin, Naproxen, Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the left shoulder and a urine drug screen. Several documents within the submitted medical records are difficult to decipher. On 07-30-2015 an Electromyography and Nerve Conduction Velocity revealed mild bilateral median sensory demyelinating neuropathies across the wrist with mild bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. There was no evidence of cervical radiculopathy on either side. On 07-30-2015 a cervical and bilateral trapezoidal and upper

thoracic ultrasounds were done and were normal. On 08-20-2015 the Utilization Review non-certified the request for Naproxen 500mg # 60; there is no documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions, an increase in activity tolerance and-or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of Naproxen use to date. A MRI left shoulder was non-certified. Within the medical information available for review, there is no documentation of a condition-diagnosis with supportive subjective-objective findings for which a shoulder Magnetic Resonance Imaging is indicated. A request for Gabapentin 300mg # 90 was non-certified due to no documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions, an increase in activity tolerance and-or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of Gabapentin use to date. Urine Analysis (UA) was non-certified. Evidence based guidelines support a urine drug screen to assess for abuse, addiction, or poor pain control in a patient under on-going opioid treatment. There is no documentation of on-going opioid treatment.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Naproxen 500mg # 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain.

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)/NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the NSAID class. The ODG state the following regarding this topic: Specific recommendations: Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) Back Pain, Acute low back pain & acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting to negative evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. (Van Tulder, 2006) (Hancock, 2007) For patients with acute low back pain with sciatica a recent Cochrane review (including three heterogeneous randomized controlled trials) found no differences in treatment with NSAIDs vs. placebo. In patients with axial low back pain this same review found that NSAIDs were not more effective than acetaminophen for acute low-back pain,

and that acetaminophen had fewer side effects. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) The addition of NSAIDs or spinal manipulative therapy does not appear to increase recovery in patients with acute low back pain over that received with acetaminophen treatment and advice from their physician. (Hancock, 2007) Back Pain, Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) See also Anti-inflammatory medications. Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long-term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough pain and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in patients with neuropathic pain. (Namaka, 2004) (Gore, 2006) See NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk; NSAIDs, hypertension and renal function; & Medications for acute pain (analgesics). Besides the above well-documented side effects of NSAIDs, there are other less well-known effects of NSAIDs, and the use of NSAIDs has been shown to possibly delay and hamper healing in all the soft tissues, including muscles, ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. (Maroon, 2006) The risks of NSAIDs in older patients, which include increased cardiovascular risk and gastrointestinal toxicity, may outweigh the benefits of these medications. (AGS, 2009) As stated above, acetaminophen would be considered first-line treatment for chronic pain. In this case, the use of an NSAID is not advised. This is secondary to the duration of use and significant side effect profile. Also, the use of NSAIDs is known to delay the healing of soft tissue including ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 300mg # 90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the category of an anti-epileptic drug (AED). These medications are recommended for certain types of neuropathic pain. Most of the randomized clinical control trials involved include post-herpetic neuralgia and painful polyneuropathy such as in diabetes. There are few trials which have studied central pain or radiculopathy. The MTUS guidelines state that a good response to treatment is 50% reduction in pain. At least a 30% reduction in pain is required for ongoing use, and if this is not seen, this should trigger a change in therapy. Their also should be documentation of functional improvement and side effects incurred with use. Disease states which prompt use of these medications include post-herpetic neuralgia, spinal cord injury, chronic regional pain syndrome, lumbar spinal stenosis, post-operative pain, and central pain. There is inadequate evidence to support use in non-specific axial low back pain or myofascial pain. In this case, there is lack of imaging findings or nerve conduction studies revealing the pain the patient is having is

neuropathic. The records also do not reveal functional improvement or screening measures as required. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Urine Analysis (UA): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

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)/Urine drug testing (UDT).

Decision rationale: The request is for a urine drug screen. The ODG states the following regarding this topic: Recommended as a tool to monitor compliance with prescribed substances, identify use of undisclosed substances, and uncover diversion of prescribed substances. The test should be used in conjunction with other clinical information when decisions are to be made to continue, adjust or discontinue treatment. This information includes clinical observation, results of addiction screening, pill counts, and prescription drug monitoring reports. The prescribing clinician should also pay close attention to information provided by family members, other providers and pharmacy personnel. The frequency of urine drug testing may be dictated by state and local laws. Indications for UDT: At the onset of treatment: (1) UDT is recommended at the onset of treatment of a new patient who is already receiving a controlled substance or when chronic opioid management is considered. Urine drug testing is not generally recommended in acute treatment settings (i.e. when opioids are required for nociceptive pain). (2) In cases in which the patient asks for a specific drug. This is particularly the case if this drug has high abuse potential, the patient refuses other drug treatment and/or changes in scheduled drugs, or refuses generic drug substitution. (3) If the patient has a positive or at risk addiction screen on evaluation. This may also include evidence of a history of comorbid psychiatric disorder such as depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, and/or personality disorder. See Opioids, screening tests for risk of addiction & misuse. (4) If aberrant behavior or misuse is suspected and/or detected. See Opioids, indicators for addiction & misuse. Ongoing monitoring: (1) If a patient has evidence of a high risk of addiction including evidence of a comorbid psychiatric disorder (such as depression, anxiety, attention-deficit disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, and/or schizophrenia), has a history of aberrant behavior, personal or family history of substance dependence (addiction), or a personal history of sexual or physical trauma, ongoing urine drug testing is indicated as an adjunct to monitoring along with clinical exams and pill counts. See Opioids, tools for risk stratification & monitoring. (2) If dose increases are not decreasing pain and increasing function, consideration of UDT should be made to aid in evaluating medication compliance and adherence. In this case, a urine drug screen is not supported by the guidelines. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of risk level commensurate to the frequency of evaluation requested. As such, it is not medically necessary.

MRI left should: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Shoulder chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Shoulder (Acute & Chronic)/MRI.

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI of the shoulder. The Official Disability Guidelines state the following regarding the qualifying indications: Indications for imaging, Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI): Acute shoulder trauma, suspect rotator cuff tear/impingement; over age 40; normal plain radiographs; Subacute shoulder pain, suspect instability/labral tear; Repeat MRI is not routinely recommended, and should be reserved for a significant change in symptoms and/or findings suggestive of significant pathology. (Mays, 2008) In this case, this study is not indicated. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of qualifying indications as listed above. As such, the request is not medically necessary.