

Case Number:	CM15-0094892		
Date Assigned:	05/21/2015	Date of Injury:	07/28/2014
Decision Date:	06/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/15/2015

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 64 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 07/28/2014. He has reported subsequent bilateral hand, back and lower extremity pain and was diagnosed with bilateral thumb arthritis at the CMC joint and bulging disc of the lumbar spine at L5-S1 with left sided S1 radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication, physical therapy and application of ice. In a progress note dated 04/13/2015, the injured worker complained of low back pain radiating to the left lower extremity. Objective findings were notable for spasm of the left lower lumbar spine, decreased range of motion of the lumbar spine with pain, point tenderness to palpation of the left lower lumbar area, positive Lasegue's test on the left, crepitus and pain about the CMC joint of the bilateral thumbs and decreased sensation to the lateral aspect of the left foot. A request for authorization of Flexeril, Celebrex and Ultram was submitted.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Flexeril 7.5mg #90 DOS: 3/11/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective Celebrex 200mg #60 DOS: 3/11/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) Page(s): 67-68, 70.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Celebrex Page(s): 68-72.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID use and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. Determine if the patient 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: Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e. g. , ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.) Patients 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). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox- 2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. Cardiovascular disease: A non-pharmacological choice should be the first option in patients 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. Cardiovascular risk does appear to extend to all non-aspirin NSAIDs, with the highest risk found for the Cox-2 agents. (Johnsen, 2005) (Lanas, 2006) (Antman, 2007) (Laine, 2007) Use with Aspirin for cardioprotective effect: In terms of GI protective effect: The GI protective effect of Cox-2 agents is diminished in patients taking low-dose aspirin and a PPI may be required for those patients

with GI risk factors. (Laine, 2007) In terms of the actual cardioprotective effect of aspirin: Traditional NSAIDs (both ibuprofen and naproxen) appear to attenuate the antiplatelet effect of enteric-coated aspirin and should be taken 30 minutes after ASA or 8 hours before. (Antman, 2007) Cox-2 NSAIDs and diclofenac (a traditional NSAID) do not decrease anti-platelet effect. (Laine, 2007) The patient does not have risk factors that would require a COX-2 inhibitor over a traditional NSAID. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective Ultram 50mg #120 DOS: 3/11/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 93-94, 76-80, 124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids: (a) If the patient has returned to work; (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant improvement in VAS scores. There are also no objective measurements of improvement in function. Therefore criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.