

Case Number:	CM15-0233316		
Date Assigned:	12/09/2015	Date of Injury:	10/15/2010
Decision Date:	01/14/2016	UR Denial Date:	11/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/30/2015

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: North Carolina
 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 59 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 10-15-10. He is not working. Medical records indicate that the injured worker has been treated for lung cancer (diagnosed 8-20-15) with partial lobectomy right lung (9-11-15); sacroiliitis; low back pain; lumbosacral radiculopathy, dorsopathy; dorsopathies, thoracolumbar region; adhesive capsulitis, unspecified shoulder; strain of unspecified muscle, fascia and tendon at shoulder and upper arm level. He currently (10-30-15) complains of left shoulder, left and right wrist, low back, bilateral lower extremity pain and left hip pain. His pain level was 4 out of 10 with medication and 7-8 out of 10 without medication. Per the 10-30-15 note there was "no evidence of developing medication dependency. No medication abuse is suspected". "With current medication regimen his symptoms are adequately managed". He walks daily for 15-30 minutes. Physical exam of the left shoulder revealed tenderness on palpation in the acromioclavicular joint, decreased, painful range of motion, positive Neer's, Hawkin's, Empty Can tests; right and left wrists revealed tenderness to palpation over the triangular fibrocartilage complex bilaterally; lumbar spine revealed restricted range of motion, spasm and tenderness on bilaterally, positive straight leg raise, decreased sensation on the L4 left dermatome pathway, sensation diminished at L5 dermatome left side. Treatments to date include medications: (past): Norco: (current): ibuprofen, cyclobenzaprine, docusate sodium, Prilosec, Voltaren XR, metformin, Norflex, Lidoderm patch. In the progress note dated 10-30-15 the treating provider recommended Lidoderm patches to treat peripheral neuropathic pain. The request for authorization was not present. On 11-5-15

utilization Review non-certified the requests for Norflex ER 100mg #60 with 1 refill; ibuprofen 800mg #60, with 1 refill; Lidoderm patch #60, with 1 refill.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norflex ER 100 mg #60 with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain but rather ongoing low back pain, this is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Ibuprofen 800 mg #60 with 1 refill: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy states: Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to

suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) 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. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another. (Roelofs-Cochrane, 2008) See also Anti-inflammatory medications. 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. This medication is recommended for the shortest period of time and at the lowest dose possible. The dosing of this medication is within the California MTUS guideline recommendations. The definition of shortest period possible is not clearly defined in the California MTUS. Therefore the request is medically necessary.

Lidoderm patches #60 with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Topical Analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical Lidocaine states: Lidocaine Indication: Neuropathic pain 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). Topical Lidocaine, in the formulation of a dermal patch (Lidoderm) has been designated for orphan status by the FDA for neuropathic pain. Lidoderm is also used off-label for diabetic neuropathy. No other commercially approved topical formulations of Lidocaine (whether creams, lotions or gels) are indicated for neuropathic pain. Non-dermal patch formulations are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. Further research is needed to recommend this treatment for chronic neuropathic pain disorders other than post-herpetic neuralgia. Formulations that do not involve a dermal-patch system are generally indicated as local anesthetics and anti-pruritics. In February 2007 the FDA notified consumers and healthcare professionals of the potential hazards of the use of topical Lidocaine. Those at particular risk were individuals that applied large amounts of this substance over large areas, left the products on for long periods of time, or used the agent with occlusive dressings. Systemic exposure was highly variable among patients. Only FDA-approved products are currently recommended. (Argoff, 2006) (Dworkin, 2007) (Khaliq-Cochrane, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Lexi-Comp, 2008) Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% Lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995) This medication is recommended for localized peripheral pain. The patient does have peripheral pain complaints. There is no documentation of

failure of first line neuropathic pain medications. Therefore criteria as set forth by the California MTUS as outlined above have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.