

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0141371		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/31/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/04/2006
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/16/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/21/2015

### 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 60 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 5-4-06. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral spondylosis without myelopathy and long-term (current) use of other medications. Currently, the injured worker reported back pain. Previous treatments included oral pain medication, medial branch blocks, and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Previous diagnostic studies included radiographic studies and computed tomography (10-1-14). The injured workers work status was not noted. The injured workers pain level was noted as 7 out of 10. Physical examination was notable for non-radicular in the lumbar spine, range of motion limited by pain, facet tenderness present at lumbar spine at L3, L4, L5, and S1 on the right side. The plan of care was for Norco 10-325 milligrams, 90 count and one urine drug screen.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325 mg, ninety count:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS). As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

**One urine drug screen:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Urine Drug Testing Section.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 76-79 and 99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter, Urine Drug Testing.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for a urine toxicology test (UDS), CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug related behaviors. ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation of the date and results of prior testing and current risk stratification to identify the medical necessity of drug screening at the proposed frequency. In light of the above issues, the currently requested urine toxicology test is not medically necessary.