

Case Number:	CM14-0122841		
Date Assigned:	09/25/2014	Date of Injury:	01/05/2012
Decision Date:	10/27/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/11/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/04/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Management and is licensed to practice in California. 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:

This is a female patient with the date of injury of January 5, 2012. A Utilization Review was performed on July 3, 2014 and recommended non-certification of Lidoderm 5%, Omeprazole DR 20 mg, Cyclobenzaprine Hcl 10 mg #60, and Acetaminophen-codeine #3. An Encounter Note dated June 4, 2014 identifies Subjective Complaints of no significant improvement. Exam identifies range of motion is markedly decreased in the cervical spine. Sensation is reduced in the right median nerve distribution. Positive Tinel's and Phalen's. First dorsal compartment is tender to palpation. Diagnoses identify brachial neuritis or radiculitis not otherwise specified and carpal tunnel syndrome. Plan identifies refill Liddoerm 5% patch, Omeprazole Dr 20 mg, Hydrocodone, and Cyclobenzaprine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidoderm 5%: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines Formulary

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): 112.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for topical lidoderm, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of topical lidocaine for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of the 1st line therapy such as tri-cyclic antidepressants, SNRIs, or antiepileptic drugs. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line therapy recommendations. Additionally, there is no documentation of analgesic effect or objective functional improvement as a result of the currently prescribed lidoderm. As such, the currently requested lidoderm is not medically necessary.

Omeprazole DR (delayed release) 20 mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Proton Pump Inhibitors.

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): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter, Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs)

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for omeprazole (Prilosec), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested omeprazole is not medically necessary.

Cyclobenzaprine HCL (hydrochloride) 10 mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter

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.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril), 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 cyclobenzaprine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the cyclobenzaprine. 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 cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) is not medically necessary.

Acetaminophen-Codeine #3 (no quantity given): Upheld

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

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.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Acetaminophen-Codeine #3, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Acetaminophen-Codeine #3 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. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Acetaminophen-Codeine #3 is not medically necessary.