

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0082343 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 05/04/2015 | Date of Injury: | 04/15/2015 |
| Decision Date: | 06/03/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 04/15/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 04/29/2015 |

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 Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 56-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 7/11/12. The injured worker reported symptoms in the right lower extremity. The injured worker was diagnosed as having foot pain, foot sprain, ankle fracture, ankle pain, and pain in limb. Treatments to date have included oral pain medication, topical patches, topical creams, and injections. Currently, the injured worker complains of pain in the right foot and right ankle. The plan of care was for medication prescriptions and a follow up appointment at a later date.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco tab 10/325mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opiates Page(s): 88 of 127.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: 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. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. There is no documentation of functional and pain improvement with previous use of Norco. There is no documentation of continuous compliance of patient to his medications. There is no documentation of continuous monitoring of the drug side effects. Therefore, the prescription of Norco tab 10/325mg #30 is not medically necessary.

Prilosec cap 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Proton pump inhibitors Page(s): 68 of 127.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDs to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient have GI issue that requires the use of prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that he is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, Prilosec cap 20mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Lidocaine 5% patch #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical lidocaine Page(s): 56 of 127.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch) Page(s): 56.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, "Lidoderm is the brand name for a lidocaine patch produced by Endo Pharmaceuticals. Topical lidocaine may be 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." In this case, there is no documentation that the patient developed neuropathic pain that did not respond to first line therapy and the need for Lidoderm patch is unclear. There is no documentation of efficacy of previous use of Lidoderm patch. Therefore, the prescription Lidocaine 5% patch #60 is not medically necessary.