

Case Number:	CM15-0121261		
Date Assigned:	07/02/2015	Date of Injury:	07/30/1998
Decision Date:	07/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/23/2015

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 65 year old female who reported an industrial injury on 7/30/1998. Her diagnoses, and/or impressions, are noted to include: Cervico-brachial syndrome; lumbar/lumbosacral disc degeneration; lumbago; and chronic pain syndrome. No current imaging studies were noted. Her treatments have included medication management. The progress notes of 5/27/2015 reported a follow-up visit for complaints of persistent, moderate pain at right side of her neck, shoulder arm and upper back that was associated with pins/needles and burning; headache, joint pain, and fatigue; poor quality of sleep; and that her pain is fairly controlled/helped by her current medications which functionally benefit her. Objective findings were noted to include noted fatigue, joint pain and headaches; mild obesity; tenderness to the bilateral cervical para-vertebral muscles; limited motor testing due to pain; and sensory deficits on the right side of the face and in the cervical 6 dermatomal distribution of the right upper extremity. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include the continuation of Norco, Lidoderm patches, and Voltaren Gel without change.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Voltaren gel 100mg #1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-114.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics, Non-selective NSAIDS Page(s): 111, 107.

Decision rationale: Voltaren Gel (Diclofenac) is a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID). 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. Diclofenac is used for osteoarthritis pain of wrist, ankle and elbow and there is no strong evidence for its use for spine pain such as lumbar spine pain and cervical pain. Therefore, the request for Voltaren gel is not medically necessary.

Norco 7.5/325mg 1 tab every 6 hours #120: Upheld

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

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. 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." According to the patient's file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325mg #120 is not medically necessary.

Lidoderm patches 700mg/patch everyday #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-114.

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 of Lidoderm patches #30 is not medically necessary.