

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0178405		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/18/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/15/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/22/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/31/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/10/2015

### 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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 33 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on December 15, 2009. He reported trauma to his cervical spine, lumbar spine and bilateral shoulders. The injured worker was currently diagnosed as having cervical strain with radicular pain, right sternoclavicular joint dislocation, status post arthroscopic subacromial decompression and debridement of right shoulder and lumbosacral strain with radicular pain. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, surgery and medications. On August 20, 2015, the injured worker complained of back pain and stiffness along with weakness, numbness and radicular pain in the bilateral legs. His back pain was described as aching, sharp, stabbing, throbbing, spasm and a pins and needles sensation. The pain was rated as a 6 on a 1-10 pain scale. He reported cervical pain along with numbness, tingling, weakness, stiffness and radicular pain in the bilateral arms. The injured worker also reported right shoulder pain described as aching, burning, soreness, stiffness, tenderness, throbbing, tingling, numbness and stabbing. The pain was rated as a 6-7 on a 1-10 pain scale. Notes stated that he has nociceptive, neuropathic and inflammatory pain. The injured worker noted "substantial benefit" of his medications with about 90% improvement in pain on the lowest effective dosing. On the day of the exam, current medications included ibuprofen, Norco, Pristiq and testosterone Cypionate. The treatment plan included testosterone Cypionate, Pristiq, Norco, ibuprofen, sacroiliac joint injection, consultation and a follow-up visit. On August 31, 2015, utilization review denied a request for ibuprofen 800mg. A request for Pristiq 50mg was authorized.

## IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Ibuprofen 800 mg:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy states: 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 naproxen being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) 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 and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. This medication is recommended for the shortest period of time and at the lowest dose possible. The dosing of this medication is within the California MTUS guideline recommendations. The definition of shortest period possible is not clearly defined in the California MTUS. However a quantity is not specified. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.