

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM14-0170609 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 10/23/2014 | Date of Injury: | 04/14/1996 |
| Decision Date: | 01/29/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 09/25/2014 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 10/15/2014 |

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 Rehab, 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:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 4/14/96. A utilization review determination dated 9/25/14 recommends non-certification of Neurontin and Lidoderm. OxyContin and Norco were modified. 9/3/14 medical report identifies neck pain with bilateral arm pain and bilateral leg symptoms. Pain is 8-9/10. Current medications are Ambien, lidocaine patches and cream, OxyContin, and Norco. On exam, there is hypersensitivity RUE>LUE, diffuse weakness L>R with noted contractures of the left arm, leg, and hip flexors. Patient had limited participation in exam secondary to pain. There was noted atrophy of the LLE leg extensors. Hypertonicity noted throughout the RUE and RLE, difficult to distinguish between spasticity and pain inhibition. Recommendations include omeprazole, ondansetron, Ambien, lidocaine cream, Lidoderm patch, OxyContin, Neurontin, and Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Omeprazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms & Cardiovascular Risk Page(s): 68.

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: Regarding the request for omeprazole (Prilosec), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested omeprazole (Prilosec) is not medically necessary.

Oxycontin 20mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for OxyContin, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it 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 OxyContin is not medically necessary.

Neurontin 300mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 16-21.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for gabapentin (Neurontin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that antiepilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that 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. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction

in pain or reduction of NRS) and objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it 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 Norco is not medically necessary.

Lidoderm patch 5%, 2 boxes: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Lidoderm, CA MTUS states that topical lidocaine is "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)." Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication of localized peripheral neuropathic pain and failure of first-line therapy. In light of the above issues, the requested Lidoderm is not medically necessary.