

Case Number:	CM15-0056039		
Date Assigned:	04/01/2015	Date of Injury:	11/27/2002
Decision Date:	05/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/24/2015

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 is a 52 year old female with an industrial injury dated November 27, 2002. The injured worker diagnoses include degeneration of cervical intervertebral disc, post laminectomy syndrome of cervical region, cervical radiculitis, cervical disc displacement, depressive disorder and insomnia. She has been treated with diagnostic studies, prescribed medications and periodic follow up visits. According to the progress note dated 02/11/2015, the injured worker reported neck and left shoulder pain. Objective findings revealed trigger point in the cervical spine and left trapezius. Tenderness to palpitation of the trapezial area, muscle spasm and restricted cervical spine range of motion were noted on exam. Objective findings also revealed decreased reflexes in the left biceps and diminished upper extremity sensation. The treating physician prescribed OxyIR, Percocet and Soma now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Percocet 10/325 #100: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Criteria for use of Opioids Page(s): 76-80.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG); Pain, Opioids.

Decision rationale: The medical records report ongoing pain that is helped subjectively by continued use of opioid. 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 nonadherent) 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 Percocet. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.

Soma 350mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol (Soma).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Soma Page(s): 29.

Decision rationale: MTUS guidelines do not support long term use of Soma. The medical records provided for review do not indicate or document the degree of functional benefit in support of continued utilization. There is no indication of treatment failure with other standard therapy muscle relaxants or indication in regard to the insured to support mitigating reason soma should be used in the insured. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.

OxyIR 15mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Criteria for use of Opioids Page(s): 76-80.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG); Pain, Opioids.

Decision rationale: The medical records report ongoing pain that is helped subjectively by continued use of opioid. 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 nonadherent) 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 OxyIR. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.