MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0050939		
Date Assigned:	03/24/2015	Date of Injury:	07/05/1995
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/17/2015

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: Florida
Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, 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 (IW) is a 52-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 07/05/1995. Diagnoses include chronic low back pain, status post lumbar decompression at L4-5 and L5-S1 with subsequent revision; lumbar degenerative disc disease and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included medications, physical therapy, back brace and TENS. He reported the back brace helped the pain when he was active and TENS therapy gave additional relief. Diagnostics performed to date included MRIs. According to the PR2 dated 2/16/15, the IW reported chronic constant low back pain with radiation into the posterior aspects of both legs to the soles of the feet with associated paresthesias. His pain was rated at 5-6/10. He also suffered a broken foot in January 2015. Prescriptions for Oxycontin and Norco were requested to keep the IW functional.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Oxycontin 10 mg, ninety count: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Section. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation official disabilty guidelines - pain, opioids.

Decision rationale: The medical records report ongoing pain with request for opioids but there is no opioid risk assessment documented. The medical records do not indicate or document any formal opioid risk mitigation tool use or assessment or indicate use of UDS or other risk tool. ODG supports 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. Given the medical records do not document such ongoing monitoring; the medical records do not support the continued use of opioids such as oxycontin.

Norco 10/325, ninety count: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Section. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation official disablity guidelines - pain, opioids.

Decision rationale: The medical records report ongoing pain with request for opioids but there is no opioid risk assessment documented. The medical records do not indicate or document any formal opioid risk mitigation tool use or assessment or indicate use of UDS or other risk tool. ODG supports 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. Given the medical records do not document such ongoing monitoring; the medical records do not support the continued use of opioids such as norco.