

Case Number:	CM14-0128750		
Date Assigned:	08/25/2014	Date of Injury:	09/07/2004
Decision Date:	12/24/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/01/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/13/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesiology, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

56 year old female injured worker has a date of injury 9/7/04 with related back pain. Per progress report dated 6/5/14, the injured worker noted persistent back pain radiating to her legs and some pain in her hips. Per physical exam, there was posterior lumbar tenderness. Sensory and motor exam of the lower extremities was intact. The documentation submitted for review did not state whether physical therapy was utilized. Treatment to date has included medication management. The date of UR decision was 8/1/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm patch #30 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p112 states "Lidocaine Indication: Neuropathic pain Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). Topical Lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch

(Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of Lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. The medical records submitted for review do not indicate that there has been a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI antidepressants or an AED). There is also no diagnosis of diabetic neuropathy or post-herpetic neuralgia. As such, Lidoderm is not recommended at this time. The request is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg #30 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG (Official Disability Guidelines) Pain Procedure Summary.

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

Decision rationale: The MTUS is silent on the treatment of insomnia. With regard to Ambien, the ODG guidelines state "Zolpidem is a prescription short-acting nonbenzodiazepine hypnotic, which is approved for the short-term (usually two to six weeks) treatment of insomnia. Proper sleep hygiene is critical to the individual with chronic pain and often is hard to obtain. Various medications may provide short-term benefit. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers, and anti-anxiety agents are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. They can be habit-forming, and they may impair function and memory more than opioid pain relievers. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term." The documentation submitted for review do not contain information regarding sleep onset, sleep maintenance, sleep quality, and next-day functioning. It was not noted whether simple sleep hygiene methods were tried and failed. The request is not medically necessary.

Ultram 50mg # 60 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids for chronic pain.

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 non-adherent) 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 Ultram or 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. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends discontinuing opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed.

Neurontin 300mg # 60 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs (AEDs) Page(s): 16-18.

Decision rationale: With regard to anti-epilepsy drugs, the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines states "Fibromyalgia: Gabapentin and Pregabalin have been found to be safe and efficacious to treat pain and other symptoms. (Arnold, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) Pregabalin is FDA approved for fibromyalgia." Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, "Gabapentin (Neurontin) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain." Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines page 17, "After initiation of treatment there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects." The documentation submitted for review did not contain evidence of pain relief and improvement in function to justify the ongoing use of this medication, as such, the request is not medically necessary.