

Case Number:	CM15-0173625		
Date Assigned:	09/15/2015	Date of Injury:	10/23/2013
Decision Date:	11/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/03/2015

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 47 year old, male who sustained a work related injury on 10-23-13. The diagnoses have included cervical radiculitis, thoracic strain-sprain and left shoulder strain-sprain. Treatments have included oral medications, myofascial release, foot injections, massage and electro stimulation. In the progress notes dated 7-1-15, the injured worker reports constant severe neck pain. He describes this pain as sharp, stabbing, throbbing neck pain with heaviness, numbness, tingling and weakness. He rates his pain level an 8 out of 10. Pain is made worse with prolonged or repetitive looking up, prolonged or repetitive looking down, prolonged driving, repetitive turning and overhead reaching. He reports frequent, severe upper-mid back pain. He describes this pain as sharp, stabbing, throbbing, burning with heaviness, numbness, tingling and weakness. He rates this pain an 8 out of 10. It is associated with repetitive movement, lifting 10 pounds, prolonged and repetitive standing, walking, driving, climbing stairs, bending, kneeling and twisting. He reports moderate, constant left shoulder pain. He describes this pain as sharp, stabbing, with heaviness, numbness, tingling, weakness and cramping. It is made worse with cold weather, sudden movement, lifting 10 pounds, prolonged driving, squeezing, pushing, repetitive pulling and repetitive overhead reaching. He rates this pain a 7 out of 10. On physical exam, He has tenderness to palpation of the bilateral trapezeii and cervical paravertebral muscles. He has muscle spasm of the cervical paravertebral muscles. He has decreased and painful range of motion in thoracic spine. He has tenderness and muscle spasm of the thoracic paravertebral muscles. He has tenderness to palpation of the left acromioclavicular joint, anterior shoulder, lateral and posterior shoulder. He is not working. The treatment plan includes refills of medicated creams.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #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): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a muscle relaxant to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines state that the use of a medication in this class is indicated as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of low back pain. Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, which can increase mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain improvement. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) Due to inadequate qualifying evidence and prolonged duration of use, the request is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Zolpidem (Ambien).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Mental(stress)/Zolpidem (Ambien).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of zolpidem. The official disability guidelines state the following regarding the use of this medication: Not recommended for long-term use, but recommended for short-term use. See Insomnia treatment for zolpidem (brand names Ambien, Edluar, Intermezzo, Zolpimist). See also the Pain Chapter. Zolpidem is approved for the short-term (usually two to six weeks) treatment of insomnia. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers, and anti-anxiety agents are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. They can be habit-forming, and they may impair function and memory more than opioid pain relievers. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term. Ambien CR offers no significant clinical advantage over regular release zolpidem, and Ambien CR causes a greater frequency of dizziness, drowsiness, and headache compared to immediate release zolpidem. Due to adverse effects, FDA now requires lower doses for zolpidem. The ER product is still more risky than IR. Even at the lower dose of Ambien CR now recommended by the FDA, 15% of women and 5%

of men still had high levels of the drug in their system in the morning. (Pain Chapter) Emergency department (ED) visits for adverse reactions related to zolpidem increased by almost 220% in a recent 5-year period, according to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Women and the elderly appear to be most prone to adverse reactions linked to zolpidem. Doctors should look at alternative strategies for treating insomnia such as sleep hygiene. By 2010 there were 64,175 ED visits involving zolpidem. The report stresses that zolpidem should be used safely for only a short period of time. (SAMHSA, 2013) Zolpidem (Ambien) increases the ability to remember images, but only those that have negative or highly arousing content. The findings have potential ramifications for patients prescribed zolpidem for relief of insomnia due to anxiety disorders, including posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Physicians should watch out for this counter therapeutic effect in patients with anxiety disorders and PTSD, because these are people who already have heightened memory for negative and high-arousal memories. The study also identified sleep spindles as the mechanism that enables the brain to consolidate emotional memory. Sleep spindles are brief bursts of brain activity that occur primarily during non-rapid eye movement (REM) sleep. (Kaestner, 2013) New analysis from SAMHSA shows that overmedicating with zolpidem led to a near doubling of emergency department (ED) visits during the periods 2005-2006 and 2009-2010. (SAMHSA, 2014) In this case, zolpidem is not indicated. This is secondary to the prolonged duration of use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Protonix 20mg #60: 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): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the class of a proton pump inhibitor. It is indicated for patients with peptic ulcer disease. It can also be used as a preventative measure in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatories for chronic pain. Unfortunately, they do have certain side effects including gastrointestinal disease. The MTUS guidelines states that patients who are classified as intermediate or high risk, should be treated prophylactically. Criteria for risk are as follows: "(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)." Due to the fact the patient does not meet to above stated criteria, the request for use is not medically necessary.

HMPC2- Flurbiprofen/Baclofen/Dexamethasone Micro/Hyaluronic acid in cream base 240 grans (20%/10%/0.2%/0.2%): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the compounded topical treatment contains an NSAID. Qualifying factors for this product is indicated by the following per the guidelines: The efficacy in clinical trials for this treatment modality has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. (Lin, 2004) (Bjordal, 2007) (Mason, 2004) When investigated specifically for osteoarthritis of the knee, topical NSAIDs have been shown to be superior to placebo for 4 to 12 weeks. Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder. FDA-approved agents: Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac): Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. In this case, as stated above, the patient would not qualify for the use of a topical NSAID. This is based on the diagnosis and treatment duration. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

HCPC1- Amitriptyline HC1/Gabapentin/Bupivacaine HC1/Hyaluronic Acid in cream base, 240grms (10%/10%5%/0.2%): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a compounded medication for topical use to aid in pain relief. These products contain multiple ingredients which each have specific properties and mechanisms of action. The MTUS guidelines state the following: "Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." In this case, the use of gabapentin is stated to be not indicated for use for the patient's condition. The guidelines state the following: "Gabapentin: Not recommended. There is no peer-reviewed literature to support use." As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Medication consultation: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Chapter 7 - Independent Medical Examinations and Consultation, page 127.

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)/Office visits.

Decision rationale: The request is for a specialty consultation. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue. The ODG state the following: Recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self care as soon as clinically feasible. The ODG Codes for Automated Approval (CAA), designed to automate claims management decision-making, indicates the number of E&M office visits (codes 99201-99285) reflecting the typical number of E&M encounters for a diagnosis, but this is not intended to limit or cap the number of E&M encounters that are medically necessary for a particular patient. Office visits that exceed the number of office visits listed in the CAA may serve as a "flag" to payors for possible evaluation, however, payors should not automatically deny payment for these if preauthorization has not been obtained. Note: The high quality medical studies required for treatment guidelines such as ODG provides guidance about specific treatments and diagnostic procedures, but not about the recommended number of E&M office visits. Studies have and are being conducted as to the value of "virtual visits" compared with inpatient visits, however the value of patient/doctor interventions has not been questioned. (Dixon, 2008) (Wallace, 2004) Further, ODG does provide guidance for therapeutic office visits not included among the E&M codes, for example Chiropractic manipulation and Physical/Occupational therapy. See also Telehealth. In this case, the request is not medically necessary. This is secondary to poor documentation as to the reasoning for the visit and consultation. There is inadequate discussion of the specific issue requiring further evaluation and assessment.