

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0018398		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/18/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/11/2001
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/30/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/24/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/13/2014

### 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 & Rehabilitation 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 61-year-old female with a 6/11/01 date of injury. At the time (1/13/14) of request for authorization for Opana ER 30mg, #90, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain) and objective (increased tone over the lumbar paravertebrals and palpable trigger point in the left thoracolumbar region characterized by twitch response and referred pain) findings, current diagnoses (chronic lumbar pain), and treatment to date (medications (including ongoing treatment with Norco, Lyrica, Diazepam, Flector patch, and Opana ER)). There is no documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and are taken as directed; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. In addition, there is no documentation of Opana ER used as second line therapy for long acting opioids. Furthermore, there is no documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of Opana ER use to date.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**OPANA ER 30MG, #90:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-80. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Oxymorphone (Opana)

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines necessitate documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and are taken as directed; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of opioids. MUS-Definitions identifies that any treatment intervention should not be continued in the absence of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications or medical services. ODG identifies Opana as second line therapy for long acting opioids. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of a diagnosis of low back pain. In addition, there is documentation of ongoing treatment with Norco and Opana ER. However, there is no documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and are taken as directed; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. In addition, there is no documentation of Opana ER used as second line therapy for long acting opioids. Furthermore, there is no documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of Opana ER use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Opana ER 30mg, #90 is not medically necessary.