

Case Number:	CM15-0047863		
Date Assigned:	03/19/2015	Date of Injury:	12/16/1996
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/13/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 63 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on December 16, 1996. She reported pain in the neck, back and upper and lower extremities. The injured worker was diagnosed as having backache, Klippel-Feil syndrome, cervicalgia, lumbago, status post fusion of the cervical spine and lumbar 3-4 interbody fusion. Treatment to date has included radiographic imaging, diagnostic studies, surgical interventions of the spine, medications and work restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of upper and lower extremity pain. The injured worker reported an industrial injury in 1996, resulting in the above noted pain. She was treated conservatively and surgically without complete resolution of the pain. Evaluation on March 10, 2015, revealed continued pain. Evaluation on April 14, 2015, revealed continued limb pain. It was noted she declined further surgical referral. Pain patches, oral pain medications, sleep aides and neuropathic pain medications were recommended.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg, #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioid Page(s): 80.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

Soma 350mg, #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol (soma) Muscle Relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 29, 64-66.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for carisoprodol (Soma), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that Soma specifically is not recommended for more than 2 to 3 weeks. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the carisoprodol. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested carisoprodol (Soma) is not medically necessary.

Lidoderm patch 5%, #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56-57.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Lidoderm, CA MTUS states that topical lidocaine is recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). Within the

documentation available for review, there is no indication of localized peripheral neuropathic pain after failure of first-line therapy. Given all of the above, the requested Lidoderm is not medically necessary.

Neurontin 100mg, #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy Drugs (AEDs) Page(s): 16-22.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 16-21 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for gabapentin (Neurontin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that antiepilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that after initiation of treatment, there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Antiepileptic drugs should not be abruptly discontinued but unfortunately there is no provision to modify the current request. As such, the currently requested gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.