MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0041191		
Date Assigned:	03/11/2015	Date of Injury:	03/09/2011
Decision Date:	04/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/04/2015

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: New Jersey, Michigan, California
Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

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 56 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 3/9/2011. She has reported getting hit in the head. The diagnoses have included post concussion syndrome, headaches, cervicalgia, and pain in the shoulder. Treatment to date has included medication therapy, a mouth guard, and acupuncture with on right shoulder joint injection reported as not effective.Currently, the IW complains of pain in the jaw and shoulders associated with headaches. The pain is rated 8-9/10 VAS and she reported difficulty eating and jaw "cracking". The physical examination from 2/10/15 documented tenderness to left jaw, cervical muscles, and mid-low back. There was "give away" weakness to right upper shoulder. Cervical Range of Motion (ROM) was noted as 80% of normal. The plan of care included obtaining a neurology consultation for post concussive headaches, medication therapy, and continued care under the oral specialist and psychiatry.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325 #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids for chronic pain Page(s): 80.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules:(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.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.According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 10/325mg #90 is not medically necessary.

Xanax .25mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Benzodiazepines Page(s): 23.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Benzodiazepines Page(s): 24.

Decision rationale: Benzodiazepines are not recommended for long term use for pain management because of unproven long term efficacy and because of the risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit their use to 4 weeks. There is no recent documentation of insomnia related to pain in this case. It has been documented that the patient has anxiety and a more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is antidepressant. There is no documentation of improvement of the patient's symptoms with the previous use of Xanax. Therefore, the use of Xanax 0.25mg #60 is not medically necessary.