

Case Number:	CM15-0140977		
Date Assigned:	07/30/2015	Date of Injury:	01/06/2009
Decision Date:	08/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/20/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 36 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on January 06, 2009. Medical records provided by the treating physician did not indicate the injured worker's mechanism of injury. The injured worker was diagnosed as having exacerbation of cervical spine pain, exacerbation of lumbar spine pain, status post discectomy at two levels, status post lumbar two to three to the posterior lumbar interbody laminectomy and discectomy, failed back syndrome, chronic pain syndrome, exacerbation of the left knee with synovitis, patellar tendinosis as seen on magnetic resonance imaging, right knee and ankle synovitis secondary to altered gait, pilonidal cyst aggravated, gastropathy secondary to medication, and worsening depression. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date has included magnetic resonance imaging of the cervical spine, psychological evaluation, magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbar spine, above noted procedures, laboratory studies, medication regimen, magnetic resonance imaging of the left knee, and physical therapy. In a progress note dated May 14, 2015 the treating physician reports complaints of pain to the bilateral knees, pain to the neck that radiates to the bilateral cervical five to six dermatomes, and pain to the low back that radiates to the bilateral lumbar three and four dermatomes. Examination reveals tenderness and spasms to the paraspinal muscles, decreased cervical range of motion, positive cervical compression testing, tenderness and spasm to the paraspinal muscles, decreased range of motion to the lumbar spine, positive straight leg raise bilaterally, tenderness to the bilateral knees, decreased range of motion to the bilateral knees, tenderness to the right ankle, and decreased range of motion to the right ankle. The injured worker's pain level was rated an 8 out of 10 to neck, a 9 out of 10 to the low back, 4

out of 10 to the right knee, and 7 out of 10 to the left knee and right ankle on a scale of 0 to 10 on a visual analog scale, but the documentation provided did not indicate the injured worker's pain level as rated on a pain scale prior to use of his medication regimen and after use of his medication regimen to indicate the effects with the use of the injured worker's current medication. Also, the documentation provided did not indicate if the injured worker experienced any functional improvement with use of his medication regimen. The treating physician requested Norco 10-325mg with a quantity of 60, noting current use of Norco 5-325mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids
Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (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. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: 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. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability.

Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids (a) If the patient has returned to work. (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant decrease in objective pain measures such as VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measures of improvement of function. Therefore all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.