

Case Number:	CM15-0109286		
Date Assigned:	06/15/2015	Date of Injury:	08/21/1997
Decision Date:	07/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/09/2015
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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 55 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/21/97. She reported pain in the back, neck, and bilateral arms. The injured worker was diagnosed as having chronic lumbosacral spinal pain and cervical spinal pain status post fusion for spondylolisthesis, revision surgery on 5/3/01 and 6/20/05 with chronic intractable spinal pain with considerations for a potential spondylolisthesis. Treatment to date has included intraarticular facet injections bilaterally at C4-5 and C5-6, L5 dorsal decompression surgery, and medication. Neck and back pain on 3/10/15 were rated as 6/10. Neck pain on 5/5/15 was rated as 5/10 and back pain was rated as 6/10. The injured worker had been taking Norco since at least 12/1/14. Currently, the injured worker complains of cervical pain and low back pain. The treating physician requested authorization for Norco 10/325mg #120.

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 Opioids.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Norco
Page(s): 75-80.

Decision rationale: With regard to this request, the California Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the following about on-going management with opioids: "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 for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs." Guidelines further recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improvement in function and reduction in pain. In the progress reports available for review, the requesting provider did not adequately document monitoring of the four domains. Improvement in function was not clearly outlined. The MTUS defines this as a clinical significant improvement in activities of daily living or a reduction in work restrictions. It is noted that the patient has been on narcotic pain medication for years including Norco and Butrans. Although there is monitoring for pain effect and side effects (including submission of CBC and BMP), these facts by themselves are insufficient to continue long term narcotics. Based on the lack of documentation, medical necessity of this request cannot be established at this time. Although this opioid is not medically necessary at this time, it should not be abruptly halted, and the requesting provider should start a weaning schedule as he or she sees fit or supply the requisite monitoring documentation to continue this medication.