

Case Number:	CM14-0083528		
Date Assigned:	07/21/2014	Date of Injury:	12/21/2010
Decision Date:	09/29/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/05/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in Nevada. 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:

The injured worker is a 58 year-old male who was reportedly injured on 12/21/2010. The mechanism of injury is not listed. The most recent progress note dated 2/13/2014 indicates that there are ongoing complaints of low back pain that radiates to the left lower extremity. The physical examination demonstrated left shoulder: decrease flexion and abduction; positive impingement; positive tenderness to palpation anterior shoulder. Thoracic spine: paraspinal muscles are tender; positive spasm noted. Lumbar spine: paraspinal muscles are tender; spasm is noted; restricted range of motion; decreased sensation in the right L5 dermatome distribution. Straight leg raise is positive on the right. No recent diagnostic studies are available for review. Previous treatment includes acupuncture, medications, and conservative treatment. A request was made for Norco 10/325mg #120 with 2 refills, Orphenadrine ER 100mg #60 with 2 refills, Voltaren gel 1%, omeprazole 20mg #30 with 2 refills, and was not certified in the pre-authorization process on 5/9/2014.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Hydrocodone (Norco) 10/325 #120 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26; MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 74-78, 88, 91 of 127.

Decision rationale: Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is a short acting opiate indicated for the management of moderate to severe breakthrough pain. The California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule guidelines support short-acting opiates at the lowest possible dose to improve pain and function, as well as the ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use and side effects. The injured employee has chronic pain; however, there is no objective clinical documentation of improvement in pain or function with the current regimen. As such, this request for Norco is not medically necessary.

Orphenadrine Er 100mg #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 65 of 127.

Decision rationale: Orphenadrine is a derivative of diphenhydramine and belongs to a family of antihistamines. It is used to treat painful muscle spasms and Parkinson's. The combination of anti-cholinergic effects and central nervous system penetration make it very useful for pain of all etiologies including radiculopathy, muscle pain, neuropathic pain and various types of headaches. It is also useful as an alternative to gabapentin for those who are intolerant of the gabapentin side effects. This medication has abuse potential due to a reported euphoric and mood elevating effect, and therefore should be used with caution as a 2nd line option for short-term use in both acute and chronic low back pain. Based on the clinical documentation provided, there is no indication that the clinician has documented trials of any previous anticonvulsant medications or medications for chronic pain such as gabapentin. Given the California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule recommendations that this be utilized as a 2nd line agent, the request is deemed not medically necessary.

Voltaren 1% Gel: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26; MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111,112 of 127.

Decision rationale: Voltaren gel is a topical non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug indicated for the relief of osteoarthritic pain of the ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist. It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip, or shoulder. Outside of the treatment of osteoarthritis, there's no other clinical indication for the use of this medication. There is no documentation of osteoarthritis in the clinical notes provided. As such, the request is considered not medically necessary per MTUS guidelines.

Omeprazole 20mg #30 with 2 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26; MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 68-69 of 127.

Decision rationale: California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule guidelines support the use of proton pump inhibitors (PPI) in patients taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medications with documented gastroesophageal distress symptoms and/or significant risk factors. Review of the available medical records, fails to document any signs or symptoms of gastrointestinal distress which would require PPI treatment. As such, this request is not considered medically necessary.