

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0195892		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/03/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/26/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/24/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/21/2014

### 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:

This is a patient with a date of injury of 7/26/11. A utilization review determination dated 10/24/14 recommends non-certification of Norco and orthopedic spine consultation. 10/9/14 medical report identifies pain in the neck, low back, shoulder, and headaches. On exam, there is tenderness, positive SLR, and pain into the shoulders with hyperextension. Recommendations include Norco and a spine consult for the lumbar spine. Initial pain medication consult was done on 10/15/14.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325 mg #120:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Norco, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing

opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Norco is not medically necessary.

**One orthopedic spine consultation:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 288.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, (2004) Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations Chapter, Page 127

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for consultation, California MTUS does not address this issue. ACOEM supports consultation if a diagnosis is uncertain or extremely complex, when psychosocial factors are present, or when the plan or course of care may benefit from additional expertise. Within the documentation available for review, there are no red flags or specific neurological findings noted in the current medical report and no clear rationale for consultation has been identified. Furthermore, the patient recently saw a pain management specialist for initial consultation and there is no indication of failure of appropriate treatment from that provider prior to consideration for surgery. In light of the above issues, the currently requested consultation is not medically necessary.