

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0101313		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/27/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/14/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/27/2015

### 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 60 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/27/09. The injured worker has complaints of low back pain. The documentation noted on examination of the lumbar spine revealed decreased range of motion in all planes and tenderness over the paraspinal musculature with hypertonicity of the thoracic and lumbar spine paraspinals. There was positive sitting straight leg raise on the right at 60 degrees to posterior thigh. The diagnoses have included lumbar disc herniation with the current flare-ups; right S1 (sacroiliac) radiculopathy and antalgic gait secondary to disc herniation. Treatment to date has included Norco for pain; Flexeril for muscle spasms of the thoracic and lumbar paraspinal muscles and injections. The request was for Norco 10/325mg #90 and Lidoderm patches 5 percent #30.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325 mg #90:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen), 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 (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS) and no discussion regarding monitoring for appropriate medication usage and 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 (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

**Lidoderm patches 5% #30:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

**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. Given all of the above, the requested Lidoderm is not medically necessary.