

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0205154		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/17/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/26/1999
<b>Decision Date:</b>	02/06/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/24/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/08/2014

### 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 52-year-old male with a 3/26/99 date of injury. At the time (11/7/14) of request for authorization for MS IR 15mg #60, there is documentation of subjective (low back pain radiating to both legs) and objective (decreased lumbar spine range of motion, positive bilateral straight leg raising test, 1+ bilateral ankle reflexes, and tenderness over the bilateral lumbar paraspinals) findings, current diagnoses (lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar spondylosis, and degenerative lumbar disc disease), and treatment to date (medications (including ongoing treatment with Morphine sulfate)). Medical report identifies that there is ongoing opioid treatment monitoring. 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 Morphine sulfate use to date.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MS IR 15mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-80; 93. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: Title 8, California Code of Regulations, section 9792.20.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines necessitate documentation of chronic pain, in patients who are in need of continuous treatment, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of Morphine sulfate. In addition, MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies 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 lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar spondylosis, and degenerative lumbar disc disease. In addition, given documentation of chronic pain, there is documentation that the patient is in need of continuous treatment. Furthermore, given documentation of ongoing opioid treatment monitoring, there is documentation that the prescriptions are from a single practitioner; the lowest possible dose is being prescribed; and there will be ongoing review and documentation of functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. However, given documentation of ongoing treatment with Morphine sulfate, 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 Morphine sulfate use to date. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for MS IR 15mg #60 is not medically necessary.