

Case Number:	CM15-0022357		
Date Assigned:	02/12/2015	Date of Injury:	08/04/1993
Decision Date:	10/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/06/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 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 61 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8-4-93. The diagnoses have included chronic cervical pain, status post two surgeries, chronic lumbar pain, obesity, weight gain, osteoarthritis of bilateral knees and sleep apnea. Treatment to date has included medications, activity modifications, surgery, diagnostics and other modalities. Currently, as per the physician progress note dated 1-7-15, the injured worker reports that the pain is under pretty good control on his current medications. He has difficulty rotating his neck. The physician notes that there were medications tried and failed. The Dilaudid did not work, the Norco did not produce enough pain relief, the Methadone caused nausea and vomiting, and the Duragesic caused him to be over sedated. The current medications included Opana, Oxycodone, Osymia, Valium, Lunesta, Ibuprofen, Omeprazole, and Promethazine. The urine drug screen dated 9-17-14 was consistent with the medications prescribed. The objective findings-physical exam reveals that neck flexion is near full, extension is 75 percent of normal and lateral rotation to the right and left is 75 percent normal. The back flexion is 60 percent, extension is 10 percent, and lateral bending to the right and left is 75 percent normal. The physician recommended for the injured worker to continue with the same medications. Work status is temporary total disability. The physician requested treatments included 30 Lunesta 3mg, 180 Opana 40mg, 90 Opana 20mg, 60 Valium 10mg, 450 Oxycodone 15mg and 30 Promethazine 25mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

30 Lunesta 3mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation (FDA, 2014) Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Mental Illness & Stress.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, Sleep Medication, Insomnia treatment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Lunesta (Eszopiclone), California MTUS guidelines are silent regarding the use of sedative hypnotic agents. ODG recommends the short-term use (usually two to six weeks) of pharmacological agents only after careful evaluation of potential causes of sleep disturbance. They go on to state the failure of sleep disturbances to resolve in 7 to 10 days, may indicate a psychiatric or medical illness. Within the documentation available for review, there are no subjective complaints of insomnia, no discussion regarding how frequently the insomnia complaints occur or how long they have been occurring, no statement indicating what behavioral treatments have been attempted for the condition of insomnia, and no statement indicating how the patient has responded to Lunesta treatment. Finally, there is no indication that Lunesta is being used for short term use as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Lunesta (Eszopiclone) is not medically necessary.

180 Opana 40mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification), Opioids, California Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) [DWC], Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids for neuropathic pain, Opioids for osteoarthritis, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain, Opioids, dealing with misuse & addiction, Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction, Opioids, dosing, Opioids, indicators for addiction, Opioids, long-term assessment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Opana (Oxymorphone), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side-effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Opana (Oxymorphone) is not medically necessary.

90 Opana 20mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification), Opioids, California Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) [DWC], Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids for neuropathic pain, Opioids for osteoarthritis, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain, Opioids, dealing with misuse & addiction, Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction, Opioids, dosing, Opioids, indicators for addiction, Opioids, long-term assessment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Opana (Oxymorphone), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Opana (Oxymorphone) is not medically necessary.

60 Valium 10mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Benzodiazepines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain Chapter, Benzodiazepines.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Valium (diazepam), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the benzodiazepines are not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation identifying any objective functional improvement as a result of the use of the medication and no rationale provided for long-term use of the medication despite the CA MTUS recommendation against long-term use. Benzodiazepines should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Valium (diazepam) is not medically necessary.

450 Oxycodone 15mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification), Opioids, California Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES) [DWC], Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain, Opioids for neuropathic pain, Opioids for osteoarthritis, Opioids, cancer pain vs. nonmalignant pain, Opioids, dealing with misuse & addiction, Opioids, differentiation: dependence & addiction, Opioids, dosing, Opioids, indicators for addiction, Opioids, long-term assessment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Oxycodone (Roxicodone), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Oxycodone (Roxicodone) is not medically necessary.

30 Promethazine 25mg: 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), Pain (Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain Chapter, Antiemetics.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for promethazine (Phenergan), California MTUS guidelines do not contain criteria regarding the use of antiemetic medication. ODG states that antiemetics are not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. Guidelines go on to state that promethazine is approved as a sedative and antiemetic for perioperative use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that promethazine is being used to treat perioperative nausea. Additionally, there are no subjective complaints of nausea in any of the recent progress reports provided for review. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested promethazine (Phenergan) is not medically necessary.