

Case Number:	CM15-0174449		
Date Assigned:	09/25/2015	Date of Injury:	06/08/2014
Decision Date:	11/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/04/2015

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:

This is a 43 year old female with a date of injury of June 8, 2014. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for right ankle sprain, plantar fasciitis of the right foot, and right hip sprain. Medical records dated May 4, 2015 indicate that the injured worker complains of right ankle pain and swelling. A progress note dated June 23, 2015 notes subjective complaints of a new injury of a fall at work with a lower back sprain and contusion of the right buttock, aggravation of the right ankle, and contusion of the left knee. Per the treating physician (June 23, 2015), the employee could continue sedentary work. The physical exam dated May 4, 2015 reveals decreased sensation of the medial anterior leg to the foot, decreased range of motion of the right ankle, anterior joint line pain, and lateral ankle pain. The progress note dated June 23, 2015 documented a physical examination that showed limping on the right ankle, decreased range of motion of the right ankle, swelling of the right ankle, pain with ankle motion, and positive drawer sign. Treatment has included injection of the right foot, and medications (Ibuprofen 800mg, Docuprene 100mg, and Omeprazole 20mg since at least March of 2015; Tylenol with Codeine 300-30mg since at least June of 2015). The original utilization review (August 14, 2015) non-certified a request for Tylenol #3 #60, Omeprazole 20mg #60, Ibuprofen 800mg #6, and Ondansetron 4mg #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Tylenol No. 3 #60 DOS: 6/24/15: 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): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of a medication in the opioid class. The MTUS guidelines state that for ongoing treatment with a pharmaceutical in this class, certain requirements are necessary. This includes not only adequate pain control, but also functional improvement. Four domains have been proposed for management of patients on opioids. This includes pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. In this case, there is inadequate documentation of persistent functional improvement seen. As such, the request is not medically necessary. All opioid medications should be titrated down slowly in order to prevent a significant withdrawal syndrome.

Retrospective Omeprazole 20mg #60 DOS: 6/24/15: 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.

Retrospective Ibuprofen 800mg #60 DOS: 6/24/15: 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)/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 continued use of an NSAID is not indicated. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of pain and functional improvement benefit seen. Also, the duration of use places the patient at risk for gastrointestinal and cardiovascular side-effects. In addition, it is known that use of NSAIDs delays the healing of soft tissue including ligaments, tendons, and cartilage. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective Ondansetron 4mg #30 DOS: 6/24/15: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Antiemetics (for opioid nausea).

Decision rationale: The request is for the use of Zofran. The MTUS and ACOEM guidelines are silent regarding this topic. The ODG guidelines states that this medication is not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. It is recommended for acute use as noted below per FDA-approved indications. Nausea and vomiting is common with use of opioids. These side effects tend to diminish over days to weeks of continued exposure. Studies of opioid adverse effects including nausea and vomiting are limited to short-term duration (less than four weeks) and have limited application to long-term use. If nausea and vomiting remains prolonged, other etiologies of these symptoms should be evaluated for. The differential diagnosis includes gastroparesis (primarily due to diabetes). Current research for treatment of nausea and vomiting as related to opioid use primarily addresses the use of antiemetics in patients with cancer pain or those utilizing opioids for acute/postoperative therapy. Recommendations based on these studies cannot be extrapolated to chronic non-malignant pain patients. There is no high-quality literature to support any one treatment for opioid-induced nausea in chronic non-malignant pain patients. (Moore 2005) Ondansetron (Zofran): This drug is a serotonin 5-HT₃ receptor antagonist. It is FDA-approved for nausea and vomiting secondary to chemotherapy and radiation treatment. It is also FDA-approved for postoperative use. Acute use is FDA-approved for gastroenteritis. In this case, the use of Zofran is not indicated. As stated above, it is not to be use for nausea and vomiting related to chronic opioid use. As such, the request is not medically necessary.