

Case Number:	CM15-0053330		
Date Assigned:	03/26/2015	Date of Injury:	02/03/1997
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/20/2015

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: Emergency 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 65 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on February 3, 1997. The injured worker was diagnosed as having post laminectomy syndrome, lumbar radiculopathy, neuritis of leg, fibromyalgia and depressive disorder. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date have included medication and surgery. A progress note dated February 26, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of low back pain with spasms and radiating to left leg with burning in his toes. He rates the pain 5-7/10 and with Norco 3/10. Physical exam notes the injured worker is unable to stay still during exam due to foot pain. The plan includes durable medical equipment for foot drop and medication.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Zohydro ER 10 mg #60 with 3 refills: 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).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, On-Going Management, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82 Page(s): 78-82.

Decision rationale: The requested Zohydro ER 10 mg #60 with 3 refills, is not medically necessary. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, On-Going Management, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82, recommend continued use of this opiate for the treatment of moderate to severe pain, with documented objective evidence of derived functional benefit, as well as documented opiate surveillance measures. The injured worker has of low back pain with spasms and radiating to left leg with burning in his toes. The treating physician has not documented VAS pain quantification with and without medications, failed first-line opiates, duration of treatment, objective evidence of derived functional benefit such as improvements in activities of daily living or reduced work restrictions or decreased reliance on medical intervention, nor measures of opiate surveillance including an executed narcotic pain contract or urine drug screening. The criteria noted above not having been met, Zohydro ER 10 mg #60 with 3 refills is not medically necessary.