

Case Number:	CM15-0022320		
Date Assigned:	02/11/2015	Date of Injury:	03/31/2013
Decision Date:	04/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/16/2015
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: Arizona, California
 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 47 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 3/31/13. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back and left lower extremity. The injured worker was diagnosed as having L4-5, L5-S1 left sided herniated disc, left knee internal derangement, left knee chondromalacia patella and medial/lateral meniscus tears, and status post left knee surgery. Treatments to date have included oral pain medication, injections, transdermal creams and activity modification. Currently, the injured worker complains of lower back pain with associated radiation to the left leg and left knee pain. The plan of care was for medication prescription and a follow up appointment at a later dated.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 82-92.

Decision rationale: Norco is a short acting opioid used for breakthrough pain. According to the MTUS guidelines, it is not indicated as 1st line therapy for neuropathic pain, and chronic back pain. It is not indicated for mechanical or compressive etiologies. It is recommended for a trial basis for short-term use. Long Term-use has not been supported by any trials. In this case, the claimant had been on Norco for over 6 months. There was no indication of attempt of weaning or failure of Tylenol use. Pain scores were high in the 9/10 range for several months while on Norco. Pain response was not consistently noted. The continued use of Norco is not medically necessary.

Ketoprofen/Cyclobenzaprine 10/4% 120mg cream: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

Decision rationale: According to the MTUS guidelines, topical analgesics are recommended as an option as indicated below. They are 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. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. Topical muscle relaxants such as Cyclobenzaprine are not recommended due to lack of evidence. Since the compound above contains topical Cyclobenzaprine, the compound in question is not medically necessary.