

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0044831		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/08/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/11/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/05/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/09/2015

### 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: New York  
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology

### 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 60-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/8/14. He reported left hip and left leg pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having hip or thigh strain, knee injury, knee sprain/strain, sleep issue, hypertension, depression. Treatment to date has included medications including NSAIDS and an ointment, knee brace, TENS unit and home exercise program. Currently, the injured worker complains of continued bilateral hip and left knee pain. The injured worker feels the knee brace is very helpful for supporting his knee. The current treatment plan is to continue oral and topical medications, TENS unit, knee brace and x-ray of hips and (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of left knee.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Omeprazole 20mg #60:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines PPIs  
Page(s): 68.

**Decision rationale:** According to CA MTUS (2009), proton pump inhibitors, such as Omeprazole (Prilosec), are recommended for patients taking NSAIDs with documented GI distress symptoms or specific GI risk factors. Risk factors include, age >65, history of peptic ulcer disease, GI bleeding, concurrent use of aspirin, corticosteroids, and/or anticoagulants or high-dose/multiple NSAIDs. There is no documentation indicating the patient has any GI symptoms or GI risk factors. In this case, Naproxen was not found to be medically necessary. Medical necessity for Omeprazole has not been established. The requested medication is not medically necessary.

**Naproxen 550mg, #60:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-71.

**Decision rationale:** Naproxen is a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID). Oral NSAIDs are recommended for the treatment of chronic pain and control of inflammation as a second-line therapy after acetaminophen. ODG states that NSAIDs are recommended for acute pain, osteoarthritis, acute low back pain (LBP), acute exacerbations of chronic pain, and short-term pain relief in chronic LBP. There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. There is inconsistent evidence for the use of NSAIDs to treat long-term neuropathic pain. Guidelines recommended that the lowest effective dose be used for the shortest duration of time consistent with treatment goals. In this case, the patient had prior use of on NSAIDs without any documentation of significant improvement. There was no documentation of objective benefit from use of this medication. Medical necessity of the requested medication has not been established. The requested medication is not medically necessary.

**Lidopro 121mg, 4 oz:** 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 rationale:** According to the California MTUS Guidelines (2009), topical analgesics are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. These agents are applied topically to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control including, for example, NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, muscle relaxants, local anesthetics or antidepressants. Guidelines indicate that any compounded product that contains at least 1 non-recommended drug (or drug class) is not recommended for use. Lidopro contains Capsaicin, Lidocaine, Menthol, and Methyl

Salicylate. The CA MTUS states that Capsaicin is recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. Topical Lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) is FDA approved for neuropathic pain, and used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other Lidocaine topical creams or lotions are indicated for neuropathic or non-neuropathic pain. Medical necessity for the requested medication has not been established. The requested topical analgesic compound is not medically necessary.

**Tens patches:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS  
Page(s): 114-121.

**Decision rationale:** According to the CA MTUS guidelines, the TENS unit is not recommended as a primary treatment modality. A one-month home-based trial may be considered as a noninvasive conservative option, if used as an adjunct to a program of evidence-based functional restoration for conditions such as, neuropathic pain, phantom limb pain, complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS), spasticity or multiple sclerosis (MS). In this case, there is limited documentation for a trial of this modality for this particular injury. In addition, there is no documentation of any functional benefit from the TENS unit under the supervision of a physical therapist. Medical necessity for the requested item has not been established. The requested TENS Unit is not medically necessary.