

Case Number:	CM15-0021923		
Date Assigned:	02/11/2015	Date of Injury:	04/08/2011
Decision Date:	03/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/26/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/05/2015

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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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:

This 57 year old man sustained an industrial injury on 4/6/2011 to his back while lifting. Current diagnoses include postlaminectomy syndrome. Treatment has included oral medications, surgical intervention, and a light home exercise program. Physician notes dated 1/12/2015 show the worker has received good pain relief from both the Hydrocodone and Voltaren gel, obtaining an estimated 70-80% relief. Recommendations include maintaining the Vicodin and Voltaren gel and obtaining a urine drug screen. On 1/26/2015, Utilization Review evaluated prescriptions for Voltaren gel 1% on tube and Hydrocodone 5/300 mg #30 that were submitted on 2/5/2014. The UR physician noted that topical NSAIDs are not recommended for treatment of the spine and there is no rationale included for the Voltaren gel. Regarding the Hydrocodone, the worker was not able to obtain the medication for a month and there was no documentation of a flare up or loss of function in this time period, there is no mention of failure of non-narcotic treatment, ongoing chronic opioid therapy is not supported. The MTUS, ACOEM Guidelines, (or ODG) was cited. The requests were denied and subsequently appealed to Independent Medical Review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Voltaren Gel 1% One Tube: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." MTUS specifically states for Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac) that it is "Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder." Medical records do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis pain in the joints. Therefore, the request for Voltaren gel is not medically necessary.

Hydrocodone 5/300mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Neck and Upper Back (Acute and Chronic), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Shoulder, Pain, Opioids

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for neck and low back pain "except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that 'ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Additionally, medical documents indicate that the patient has been on an opioid in excess of the recommended 2-week limit. The treating physician does not detail sufficient information to substantiate the need for continued opioid medication. Prior utilization reviews have noted the need for tapering and weaning, which is appropriate. As such, the question for hydrocodone is not medically necessary.

