

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0116328		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/04/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/28/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/08/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/07/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/23/2014

### 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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Neurology, has a subspecialty in Neuromuscular Medicine and is licensed to practice in New Jersey. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### 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 patient is a 52-year-old woman who sustained a work related injury on September 28, 2012. Subsequently, she developed low back pain. According to a note dated July 7, 2014, a clinical encounter dated June 19, 2014 stated the patient reported bilateral low back pain that radiated to the left L5 distribution, left buttock, left hip, left posterior thigh, left leg, and left heel. The pain was described as aching, pulsating, shooting, and throbbing. The pain was rated at 4-8/10. The associated symptoms included stiffness spasms of the lower back. The symptoms were aggravated by any activities, bending, and carrying. The symptoms were alleviated by medication, stretching, and rest. On examination, there is a lumbar tenderness with reduced range of motion. MRI of the lumbar spine dated April 9, 2014 showed multilevel degenerative disc disease (L3-4, L4-5, and L5-S1), diffuse bulge of the disc with bilateral mild foraminal narrowing, mild facet arthropathy, and a tiny superimposed tear. Prior treatment included physical therapy and medications (Hydrocodone-Acetaminophen, Ibuprofen, Voltaren, and Norco). The UDS dated June 19, 2014 was negative. The patient was diagnosed with degeneration of lumbosacral intervertebral disc, sprain of the sacroiliac ligament, lumbosacral radiculitis, low back pain, and long term drug therapy. The provider requested authorization for Ibuprofen, Norco, and Voltaren.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Ibuprofen 800mg #60 1 refill:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78-80.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NONSELECTIVE NSAIDS Page(s): 107.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, According to MTUS guidelines, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines chapter, NON SELECTIVE NSAIDS section, Ibuprofen is indicated for pain management of breakthrough of neck or back pain. The medication should be used at the lowest dose and for a short period of time. There is no documentation that the patient developed exacerbation of his pain. There is no documentation that the lowest dose and shortest period is used for this patient. Although the patient developed a chronic neck and back pain that may require Ibuprofen, there is no documentation that the provider recommended the lowest dose of Ibuprofen for the shortest period of time. There is no documentation of pain and functional improvement with previous use of Ibuprofen. Therefore, the prescription of Ibuprofen 800 mg is not medically necessary.

**Norco 10/325mg #30 refill 1:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 91.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 179.

**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. 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 clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement with previous use of opioids (Norco). There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Norco. There is no clear justification for the need to continue the use of Norco. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325 mg #30 is not medically necessary.

**Voltaren 1 percent Topical gel #5 100g Refill 2:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines- Topical Analgesic Page(.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111); topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. There is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. There is no documentation of failure of NSAID oral medication for the treatment of pain. Therefore, topical analgesic Voltaren cream 100 mg is not medically necessary.