

Case Number:	CM15-0108479		
Date Assigned:	06/15/2015	Date of Injury:	03/14/2011
Decision Date:	07/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/05/2015

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
 State(s) of Licensure: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 51 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 3/14/2011. The current diagnoses are cervical pain; status post cervical fusion (2011). According to the progress report dated 5/21/2015, the injured worker complains of neck pain with radiation to her bilateral shoulders and right arm. The pain is rated 2/10 with medications and 8/10 without. The physical examination of the cervical spine reveals restricted range of motion, tenderness with tight muscle band over the bilateral paravertebral muscles, and tenderness over the paracervical muscles and trapezius. The current medications are Cyclobenzaprine, Norco, and Ambien. Treatment to date has included medication management, x-rays, MRI studies, computed tomography scan, electrodiagnostic testing, physical therapy (moderate pain relief), chiropractic (moderate pain relief), epidural steroid injection (excellent pain relief), home exercise program, and surgical intervention. The plan of care includes prescription for Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #90, 1 refill: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: "(a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. 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 non adherent) 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." According to the patient's file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without any evidence of functional improvement, consistent UDS, and attempts at weaning. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325mg #90 with 1 refill is not medically necessary.