

Case Number:	CM14-0124375		
Date Assigned:	08/08/2014	Date of Injury:	08/02/2003
Decision Date:	09/22/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/07/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/06/2014

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 Anesthesiology, 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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 44-year-old male with a 8/2/03 date of injury. At the time (7/7/14) of request for authorization for Norco 10/325mg #180, there is documentation of subjective (back pain, aching and constant, pain rated 4/10) and objective (lumbar spine tenderness, facet joint tenderness, and decreased flexion and extension) findings, current diagnoses (lumbago, low back pain), and treatment to date (epidural steroid injection and medications (including ongoing use of Norco since at least 2/7/14)). 6/6/14 medical report identifies that medications are working with no side effects. There is no documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and that the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and 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 Norco use to date.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #180: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-80.

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. MTUS-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. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of lumbago, low back pain. In addition, there is documentation ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. However, there is no documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner and that the lowest possible dose is being prescribed. In addition, given medical records reflecting prescriptions for Norco since at least 2/14, 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 Norco use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for Norco 10/325mg #180 is not medically necessary.