

Case Number:	CM15-0130232		
Date Assigned:	07/17/2015	Date of Injury:	08/15/2005
Decision Date:	08/19/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/06/2015

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(n) 53 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/15/05. She reported pain in her neck and bilateral upper extremities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having brachial neuritis and cervical radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included a cervical epidural injection on 3/19/15 with 60% improvement, physical therapy, Norflex, Ambien and Ultram since at least 12/23/14. On 5/12/15, the injured worker rated her pain a 7/10. As of the PR2 dated 6/2/15, the injured worker reports continued cervical spine pain radiating to the bilateral upper extremities. Objective findings include spasms and guarding in the paravertebral musculature and decreased cervical range of motion. The treating physician requested Ambien 5mg #180, LidoPro 121gram #6, Norflex 100mg #360 and Ultram ER 150mg #360.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ambien 5mg tablets #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Zolpidem (Ambien).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, Sleep Medication, Insomnia treatment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for zolpidem (Ambien), California MTUS guidelines are silent regarding the use of sedative hypnotic agents. ODG recommends the short-term use (usually two to six weeks) of pharmacological agents only after careful evaluation of potential causes of sleep disturbance. They go on to state the failure of sleep disturbances to resolve in 7 to 10 days, may indicate a psychiatric or medical illness. Within the documentation available for review, there is no current description of the patient's insomnia, no discussion regarding what behavioral treatments have been attempted, and no statement indicating how the patient has responded to Ambien treatment. Furthermore, there is no indication that Ambien is being used for short term use as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested zolpidem (Ambien) is not medically necessary.

LidoPro ointment 121 grams #6: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page 111-113 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: <http://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/lookup.cfm?setid=ef3f3597-94b9-4865-b805-a84b224a207e>.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for LidoPro, LidoPro contains Capsaicin 0.0325%, Lidocaine 4.5%, Menthol 10%, and Methyl Salicylate 27.5%. Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended, is not recommended. Regarding use of capsaicin, guidelines state that it is recommended only as an option for patients who did not respond to or are intolerant to other treatments. Regarding the use of topical lidocaine, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of topical lidocaine for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of the 1st line therapy such as tri-cyclic antidepressants, SNRIs, or antiepileptic drugs. Guidelines go on to state that no commercially approved topical formulations of lidocaine cream, lotion, or gel are indicated for neuropathic pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line therapy recommendations. Furthermore, guidelines do not support the use of topical lidocaine preparations which are not in patch form. In addition, there is no indication that the patient has been intolerant to or did not respond to other treatments prior to the initiation of capsaicin therapy. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested LidoPro is not medically necessary.

Norflex 100mg tablets #360: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Orphenadrine; Muscle relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 65; 63-66.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for orphenadrine (Norflex), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that orphenadrine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the orphenadrine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. Finally, there is no documentation of failure of first-line treatment options, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested orphenadrine (Norflex) is not medically necessary.

Ultram ER 150mg tablets #360: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 93-94, 113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultram ER (tramadol), 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 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 Ultram ER (tramadol) is not medically necessary.