

Case Number:	CM14-0191824		
Date Assigned:	11/20/2014	Date of Injury:	04/24/2014
Decision Date:	01/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/05/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/17/2014

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:

This patient sustained an injury on 4/24/14 while employed by [REDACTED]. Request(s) under consideration include Norco 10/325mg #160, Ultram ER 150mg #60, and Urine drug screen. Diagnoses include right 5th metatarsal fracture s/p ORIF on 5/24/14; post injury CRPS of right leg; and left knee contusion, resolved. The patient had recent UDS dated 10/9/14 indicating consistent positive findings for Hydrocodone and Hydromorphone for Norco. Report of 10/9/14 from the provider noted the patient persistent pain, swelling, and tingling in the right lower extremity; diminished to some degree following recent sympathetic block. Medications list Baclofen, Gabapentin, Hydrocodone, Estradiol, Vitamins, and supplements. Exam showed diffuse tenderness about the foot/ankle with mild diffuse swelling over right foot; mottles with some hyperhidrosis at plantar surface. Treatment included repeat sympathetic block and refill of medications with UDS. The patient remained TTD status. The request(s) for Norco 10/325mg #160 and Ultram ER 150mg #60 were denied and Urine drug screen was modified for 10 panel random UDS on 11/5/14 citing guidelines criteria and lack of medical necessity.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #160: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, On-Going Management- Actions Should Include Page(s): 74-96.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Norco 10/325mg #160 is not medically necessary.

Ultram ER 150mg #60: 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): 74-96.

Decision rationale: Pain symptoms and clinical findings remain unchanged for this chronic injury. Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or returned to work status. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this injury. In addition, submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the specific indication to support for chronic opioid use without acute flare-up, new injuries, or progressive clinical deficits to support for chronic opioids outside recommendations of the guidelines. The Ultram ER 150mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Urine drug screen: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing Page(s): 43.

Decision rationale: The patient had recent UDS on 10/9/14. Per MTUS Guidelines, urine drug screening is recommended as an option before a therapeutic trial of opioids and for on-going management to differentiate issues of abuse, addiction, misuse, or poor pain control; none of which apply to this patient who has been prescribed long-term opioid this April 2014 injury. Presented medical reports from the provider have unchanged chronic severe pain symptoms with unchanged clinical findings of restricted range and tenderness without acute new deficits or red-flag condition changes. Treatment plan remains unchanged with continued medication refills without change in dosing or prescription for chronic pain. There is no report of aberrant behaviors, illicit drug use, and report of acute injury or change in clinical findings or risk factors to support frequent UDS. Documented abuse, misuse, poor pain control, history of unexpected positive results for a non-prescribed scheduled drug or illicit drug or history of negative results for prescribed medications may warrant UDS and place the patient in a higher risk level; however, none are provided. The Urine drug screen is not medically necessary.