

Case Number:	CM15-0130097		
Date Assigned:	07/16/2015	Date of Injury:	06/04/1998
Decision Date:	09/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/06/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 63 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 6/4/98. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbago, post-laminectomy syndrome lumbar region, lumbosacral spondylosis without myelopathy, spasm of muscle, unspecified myalgia and myositis and thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis, unspecified. Currently, the injured worker was with complaints of decreased sleep, short tempered and with chronic lumbar and leg pain. Previous treatments included status post hardware removal, oral pain medication, oral analgesic, oral muscle relaxant, oral antidepressant and oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Previous diagnostic studies included a magnetic resonance imaging. The injured work status was noted as working/retired/on disability. The injured workers average pain level was noted as 8/10. Physical examination was notable for healthy, in no acute distress. The plan of care was for Norco 10/325 milligrams quantity of 90.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use for a therapeutic trial of opioids.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids
Page(s): 78, 91.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of 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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Norco nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the ongoing management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. The only mention of UDS was baseline testing from 7/2013. As MTUS recommends discontinuation of opioids, the request is not medically necessary.