

Case Number:	CM14-0150800		
Date Assigned:	09/19/2014	Date of Injury:	06/14/2013
Decision Date:	10/21/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/19/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/16/2014

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 Medicine 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:

The injured worker is a 50-year-old male with an original industrial injury on June 14, 2013. The injured worker has chronic bilateral shoulder pain, lumbar belt you, lumbar radiculopathy, and chronic neck pain. Previous treatments have included pain medications and physical therapy. The disputed request is for Norco. This had previously been disputed in utilization review and weaning at that time was recommended due to a lack of documented functional improvement. A recent utilization review decision on August 19, 2014 had stated that the "continued use of Norco is not indicated for this injured worker."

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5/325mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioid Page(s): 76-80.

Decision rationale: The Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines on pages 76-80 state the following criteria for the ongoing use of opioids, including:"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. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: 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 nonadherent) 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 for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000)"In the case of this injured worker, the 4 domains of ongoing management are not met. "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 nonadherent) drug-related behaviors." There is evidence of urine drug testing, such as the urine drug screen performed on August 12, 2014. The submitted documentation fails to demonstrate that appropriate documentation of functional improvement attributable to Norco. Therefore this request is not medically necessary.