

Case Number:	CM15-0194934		
Date Assigned:	10/08/2015	Date of Injury:	06/14/2013
Decision Date:	11/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/05/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 58 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 14, 2013. The initial symptoms reported by the injured worker are unknown. The injured worker was currently diagnosed as having end-stage osteoarthropathy right knee and left knee pain. On May 13, 2015, notes stated that the injured worker has undergone considerable conservative management, including physical therapy and corticosteroid injections. On August 5, 2015, the injured worker complained of bilateral knee pain. Physical examination of the bilateral knees revealed chronic inflammation and swelling. He also reported stress, anxiety and depression. The treatment plan included right knee arthroscopy, Norco, Flector patches, psych consultation and follow-up visit. On August 31, 2015, utilization review denied a request for Norco 5-325mg #60 and Flector patches #12.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5/325mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS states: When to Continue Opioids: (a) If the patient has returned to work; (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004). The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant improvement in VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measurements of improvement in function or activity specifically due to the medication. Therefore not all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Flector patches #12: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical analgesics states: Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Topical NSAIDs have been shown in meta-analysis to be superior to placebo during the first 2 weeks of treatment for osteoarthritis, but either not afterward, or with a diminishing effect over another 2-week period. Topical analgesic NSAID formulations are not indicated for long-term use and have little evidence for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder. This patient does not have a diagnosis of osteoarthritis or neuropathic pain that has failed first line treatment options but rather the diagnosis of knee pain. Therefore, criteria for the use of topical NSAID therapy per the California MTUS have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.