

Case Number:	CM14-0173504		
Date Assigned:	01/27/2015	Date of Injury:	03/21/1997
Decision Date:	03/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/30/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/21/2014

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. 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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 patient is a 74-year-old woman who sustained a work-related injury on March 21, 1997. Subsequently, the patient developed with chronic low back pain. According to a progress report dated on September 9 2014, the patient was complaining of ongoing back pain. The pain severity was rated 9/10 despite pain medication and physical therapy the patient physical examination demonstrated antalgic gait, lumbar tenderness with reduced range of motion and positive straight leg raising. The provider request authorization for Norco and lidocaine patch.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5/325mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids, Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules:(a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy.(b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function.(c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. 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 aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325 mg, is not medically necessary.

Lidocaine patches: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm(Lidocaine).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch), Page(s): 56.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by Endo Pharmaceuticals. Topical lidocaine may be 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. In this case, there is no documentation that the patient developed neuropathic pain that did not respond to first line therapy and the need for Lidoderm patch is unclear. There is no documentation of efficacy of previous use of Lidoderm patch. Therefore, the prescription of Lidocaine patches not medically necessary.