

Case Number:	CM15-0098424		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2015	Date of Injury:	06/08/2012
Decision Date:	08/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/22/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
 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 32 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 6/8/12 from a traffic accident that affected his lumbar spine, right knee, right shoulder and cervical spine. He was medically evaluated and had MRI's of the neck, low back and right knee. He currently has acute post-operative right knee pain. He uses crutches to ambulate. On physical exam there was right knee swelling and tenderness on palpation of the right knee area with very limited range of motion. Medications were Duragesic patch, Ultracet, Anaprox, Prilosec. Diagnoses include status post right knee anterior cruciate ligament with medial meniscus repair (10/17/14); status post L4-5, L5-S1 laminectomy/discectomy (9/13/13); right shoulder internal derangement; left wrist trauma, status post open reduction internal fixation (5/2014); reactionary depression/ anxiety; medication induced gastritis. Treatments to date include medications; physical therapy; right knee brace. Diagnostics included MRI of the right knee (4/25/14) showing large complex bucket handle tear of the medial meniscus, torn posterior meniscal root ligament. In the progress note dated 4/22/15 the treating provider's plan of care includes requested for Ultracet 377.5/325 mg # 60; Anaprox DS 550 mg # 60; Prilosec 20 mg # 60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

60 Ultracet 37.5/325mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Ultracet nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. Per progress report dated 1/9/15 it was noted that the injured worker's urine was qualitatively positive for opiates, benzodiazepines, amphetamines which was consistent with the injured worker's medication regimen. With regard to medication history, the documentation indicates that the injured worker has been using this medication since at least 1/9/15. As MTUS recommends to discontinue opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, the request is not medically necessary.

60 Anaprox DS 550mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68.

Decision rationale: With regard to the use of NSAIDs for chronic low back pain, the MTUS CPMTG states "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." "Low back pain (chronic): Both acetaminophen and NSAIDs have

been recommended as first line therapy for low back pain. There is insufficient evidence to recommend one medication over the other. Selection should be made on a case-by-case basis based on weighing efficacy vs. side effect profile." The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker has using this medication since at least 10/2014. As it is only recommended for short-term symptomatic relief, the request is not medically necessary.

60 Prilosec 20mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: In the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy, the MTUS recommends stopping the NSAID, switching to a different NSAID, or considering the use of an H2-receptor antagonist or a PPI. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of proton pump inhibitors in conjunction with NSAIDs in situations in which the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events including: (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). CPMTG guidelines further specify: "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 (200 g 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. Patients 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 cardioprotection) and a PPI. If cardiovascular risk is greater than GI risk the suggestion is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. (Laine, 2006) (Scholmerich, 2006) (Nielsen, 2006) (Chan, 2004) (Gold, 2007) (Laine, 2007)" The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker had medication induced gastritis symptoms and night time GERD symptoms which were controlled with Prilosec, however, as NSAID therapy is not indicated for the injured worker, the request is not medically necessary.