

Case Number:	CM15-0044452		
Date Assigned:	03/16/2015	Date of Injury:	06/05/2014
Decision Date:	04/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/25/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/09/2015

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 42 year old male patient, who sustained an industrial injury on 06/05/2014. A primary treating office visit dated 12/11/2014, reported subjective complaints of persistent bilateral hand and wrist pain. He states the left hand is just as bothersome as the right now. He is recuperating from right ulnar nerve release and right wrist surgery on 11/05/200214. The patient is interested in seeking surgical consultation for his left hand and wrist. He is also in need of refills for medications. He is currently prescribed Norco 10/325mg four daily and Relafen 750mg twice daily. Objective findings stated no significant change. The following diagnoses are applied; chronic bilateral wrist and elbow pains and lumbar spine with degenerative changes. He was given a 2 month supply of medications and should continue to follow up post-operatively with surgeon. The patient is temporarily totally disabled through 02/11/2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325 mg Qty 240: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74.

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 #240 is not medically necessary.

Relafen 750 mg Qty 120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 263-264. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Pain (Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, NSAIDs are recommended for knee and hip pain at the lowest dose for the shortest period of time in patients with moderate to severe pain. In this case, the request was for Relafen 750 mg #120, which does not comply with MTUS guidelines for the use of NSAIDs for short period of time. In addition, there is no recent documentation that the patient was complaining of breakthrough of pain. There is no clear evidence that the lowest NSAID was used. Therefore, the request of Relafen 750mg #120 is not medically necessary.

Urine drug screen: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids: Criteria for Use Page(s): 88. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Pain (Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction Page(s): 77-78; 94.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, urine toxicology screens is indicated to avoid misuse/addiction. "(j) Consider the use of a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs." There is no evidence that the patient have aberrant behavior for urine drug screen. There is no clear evidence of abuse, addiction and poor pain control. There is no documentation that the patient has a history of use of illicit drugs. Therefore, the request for Urine drug screen is not medically necessary.