

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0104202		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/08/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/24/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/08/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/21/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/01/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Alabama, 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 injured worker is a 41 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on July 24, 2014. He has reported pain to the neck, mid back, and low back and has been diagnosed with lumbosacral joint ligament sprain/strain, cervical sprain/strain, thoracic sprain/strain, contusion of the hip, and contusion of the chest. Treatment has included chiropractic care, medications, TENS unit, and a home exercise program. Lumbar flexion was at 45 degrees, right lateral flexion was at 15-20 degrees, and left lateral flexion was at 10 degrees. There was  $\frac{3}{4}$  spasm and tenderness to the right neck, upper back, mid back, low back, and buttock. There was  $\frac{3}{4}$  tenderness at the right SI joint. The treatment request included Norco and Lidopro cream.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325 mg Qty 140:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78-80, 88.

**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 return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. There is no documentation of compliance of the patient with his medications. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325 mg Qty 140 is not medically necessary.

**Lidopro cream 121 gm:** Upheld

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

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

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111), topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. That is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. Lido Pro (capsaicin, menthol and methyl salicylate and lidocaine) contains capsaicin a topical analgesic and lidocaine not recommended by MTUS. There is no documentation of pain and functional improvement with previous use of Lido Pro. Based on the above Lidopro cream 121 gm is not medically necessary.