

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0066609		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/14/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/22/2004
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/11/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/02/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/08/2015

### 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: Massachusetts

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

### 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 52-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 07/22/2004. The initial complaints or symptoms included back pain/injury. The initial diagnoses were not mentioned in the clinical notes. Treatment to date has included conservative care, medications, diagnostic imaging, conservative therapies, and lumbar fusion surgery. Currently (progress note dated 03/23/2015), the injured worker complains of increased low back pain. Current medications include Norco, Requip, Voltaren gel and Depakote. The diagnoses include major depressive disorder, anxiety disorder, pain disorder, lumbago, and lumbar degenerative disc disease. The request for authorization consisted of Nexium, Flexeril and Miralax.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Nexium 40mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines PPI Page(s): 68-69.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS makes the following recommendations for the use of proton pump inhibitors. Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. Determine if the injured worker is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (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). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. Recommendations Injured workers with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g, ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.) Injured workers 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 (200g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44). Injured workers at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. Injured workers at high risk of gastrointestinal events with cardiovascular disease: If GI risk is high the suggestion is for a low-dose Cox-2 plus low dose Aspirin (for cardio protection) and a PPI. If cardiovascular risk is greater than GI risk, the suggestion is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. Cardiovascular disease: A non-pharmacological choice should be the first option in injured workers with cardiac risk factors. It is then suggested that acetaminophen or aspirin be used for short-term needs. An opioid also remains a short-term alternative for analgesia. Major risk factors (recent MI, or coronary artery surgery, including recent stent placement): If NSAID therapy is necessary, the suggested treatment is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. Mild to moderate risk factors: If long-term or high-dose therapy is required, full-dose naproxen (500 mg twice a day) appears to be the preferred choice of NSAID. If naproxyn is ineffective, the suggested treatment is (1) the addition of aspirin to naproxyn plus a PPI, or (2) a low-dose Cox-2 plus ASA. According to the records available for review the injured worker does not meet any of the guidelines required for the use of this medication therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

**Flexeril 10mg #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 63-64.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Flexeril Page(s): 41-42.

**Decision rationale:** Accordingly, to the MTUS, current treatment guidelines recommend this medication is an option for chronic pain using a short course of therapy. The effect of Flexeril is great is the first four days of treatment, suggesting a shorter course as many better. This medication is not recommended as an addition to other medications. Longer course of Flexeril also are not recommended to be for longer than 2 to 3 weeks as prolonged use me lead to dependence. According to the records, the injured worker has been taking his medication chronically. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.

**Miralax 527gm with 4 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1843963>.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM Chapter 12 on low back indicates that specialized treatments or referrals require a rationale for their use. According to the documents available for review, there is no rationale provided to support the use of Miralax. Therefore, at this time the requirements for treatment have not been met, and medical necessity has not been established