

Case Number:	CM15-0093248		
Date Assigned:	05/19/2015	Date of Injury:	03/30/2001
Decision Date:	06/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/29/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/14/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 53-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on March 30, 2001. The injured worker reported repetitive stress injury to cervical and lumbar spine while working in data entry. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar radiculopathy and post lumbar laminectomy syndrome. Treatment to date has included medication, numerous epidural steroid injection, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), electromyogram, nerve conduction study and lab work. A progress note dated March 18, 2015 the injured worker complains of back pain radiating down both legs. She reports pain is increased and rated 7/10 with medication and 9/10 without medication. She reports medications are working well. Physical exam notes slow gait, lumbar surgical scar tenderness on palpation and decreased range of motion (ROM). The plan includes Percocet, naproxen and neurology consultation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Naproxen Sodium 550mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 67-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Naproxen, NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) 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. 4) 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. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. Additionally, the treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Progress notes indicate the patient has been on naproxen since at least 2012, but the MTUS guidelines recommend against long-term use. The medical documentation provided does not indicate this patient has objective functional improvement with the use of Naproxen. As such, the request for Naproxen Sodium 550mg #60 is not medically necessary.