

Case Number:	CM15-0041405		
Date Assigned:	03/11/2015	Date of Injury:	10/06/2012
Decision Date:	04/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/04/2015

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:

The injured worker is a 33 year old female who sustained a work related injury October 6, 2012. She slipped and fell getting out of the car and twisted her right knee, landing on concrete with her left arm behind her back. She noticed pain to her neck, left shoulder, back and right knee and radiation of pain from her neck to her back. Past history included arthroscopic partial medial and lateral meniscectomy, chondroplasty, medial femoral condyle, medial and lateral tibial plateaus and debridement of intracondylar notch, right knee, June, 2014. According to a primary treating physician's progress report dated January 5, 2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of; aching and sharp neck pain with weakness in the muscles of her neck; low back pain described as sharp aching and cramping; left shoulder pain described as sharp aching and cramping and right knee pain with numbness, burning and sensation of pins and needles, which is constant and severe. She ambulates with an antalgic gait, favoring the right side and uses a can in her left hand. Diagnoses are documented as cervical spine sprain/strain; cervicgia; left shoulder impingement and rotator cuff tear; lumbar spine strain/sprain; disc bulging L2-3, L3-4 L4-5 compressing L5 nerve root; tear right medial meniscus, s/p right knee surgery. According to a request for authorization dated January 5, 2015, requests for authorization were made for Gaba/Flur compound cream, Motrin, Norco and urine toxicology screen.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg: Upheld

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

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, low back, and shoulder 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 Norco or other opioid in excess of the recommended 2-week limit. As such, the request for Norco 325/10mg is not medically necessary.

Motrin 800mg: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Naproxen, NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain - Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective than acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) Back Pain - Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. 4) Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as

osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. Additionally, the treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Progress notes do not indicate how long the patient has been on naproxen, but the MTUS guidelines recommend against long-term use. Dyesthesia pain is present, but as MTUS outlines, the evidence for NSAID use in neuropathic pain is inconsistent. As such, the request for Motrin 800mg is not medically necessary.

Gaba/Flur compound cream 240gm: 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 states that the only FDA- approved NSAID medication for topical use includes diclofenac, which is indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints. Flurbiprofen would not be indicated for topical use in this case. Therefore, the request for Gaba/Flur compound cream is not medically necessary.

Urine toxicology screen: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids; substance abuse Page(s): 74-109. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation University of Michigan Health System Guidelines for Clinical Care: Managing Chronic Non-terminal Pain, Including Prescribing Controlled Substances (May 2009), pg 32 Established Patients Using a Controlled Substance.

Decision rationale: MTUS states that use of urine drug screening for illegal drugs should be considered before therapeutic trial of opioids are initiated. Additionally, "Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion) would indicate need for urine drug screening. There is insufficient documentation provided to suggest issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control by the treating physician. University of Michigan Health System Guidelines for Clinical Care: Managing Chronic Non-terminal Pain, Including Prescribing Controlled Substances (May 2009) recommends for stable patients without red flags twice yearly urine drug screening for all chronic non-malignant pain patients receiving opioids

once during January-June and another July-December." The patient has been on chronic opioid therapy. The treating physician has not indicated why a urine drug screen is necessary at this time and has provided no evidence of red flags. As such, the request for U/A TEST FOR TOXICOLOGY is not medically necessary.