

Case Number:	CM15-0168088		
Date Assigned:	09/08/2015	Date of Injury:	09/23/2014
Decision Date:	10/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/26/2015

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:

This is a 43-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 09-23-2014 caused by lifting buckets of cement. A review of the medical records indicated the injured worker (IW) was being treated for C5-C6 1 to 2 mm central disc herniation that abuts the thecal sac per MRI (11-6-2014); bilateral shoulder sprain, strain; bilateral upper extremity sprain, strain; possible lumbar radiculopathy; and L5 grade I degenerative retrolisthesis of 2.2 mm (MRI 12-6-14). Treatment to date has included medications (Norco and Motrin), physical therapy (PT), elbow strap, activity modifications and chiropractic treatment. The Panel Qualified Medical Evaluation on 4-17-2015 stated the IW had 15 sessions of PT and an unspecified number of chiropractic treatments that did not help; the elbow strap also did not help. There were no drug screen results available for review or evidence of a signed pain medication contract. Progress notes dated 4-20-2015 stated the IW was not working. According to the treating provider's notes dated 5-11-2015 and 7-13-2015, the injured worker experienced increased pain levels in the neck and bilateral shoulders, rating the pain 5 out of 10 and then 6 out of 10. Lumbar spine pain was unchanged at 6 out of 10. The notes from 7-13-2015 also indicated the IW had pain rated 6 out of 10 in the bilateral arms to the hands, in the lower back, right buttock, right hip and down the right lower extremity to the knee. Physical examinations on those dates showed no change in the neck and low back. A request was made for Norco 10-325mg, #60, one every 6 to 8 hours as needed; the request was non-certified in the original Utilization Review on 8-12-2015 because the CA MTUS guidelines for short-acting opioids were not met.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #60 one very 6-8 hours as needed: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids specific drug list; Short-acting Opioids Page(s): 91, 75 of 127.

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 nonopioid 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 improvement in VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measurements of improvement in function. Therefore all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary