

Case Number:	CM15-0056136		
Date Assigned:	04/01/2015	Date of Injury:	04/20/2001
Decision Date:	05/11/2015	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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 58-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 4/20/2001, after she lost her balance and fell. The injured worker was diagnosed as having right elbow strain and tendinitis, right wrist and forearm tendinitis with right carpal tunnel syndrome, right shoulder strain with spontaneous exacerbation since 8/2010, right cervical and trapezius strain with right cervical radiculitis, with abnormal MRI showing disc bulges (report not included), left wrist/forearm pain with paresthesia, and chronic gastrointestinal esophageal reflux disease due to the use of pain medication. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, medications, carpal tunnel braces, and home exercises. On 12/08/2014, the injured worker complained of right upper extremity pain, rated 4/10 and left wrist discomfort, rated 0/10, although the numbers did increase with use. Gastrointestinal upset due to pain medication use was documented as stable. Urine drug screening was referenced as consistent, although the report was not included. She used a cane for ambulation and put a considerable amount of pressure on her right hand. Medication use included Norco and Omeprazole (since at least 8/2014).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, specific drug list; Weaning of Medications Page(s): 78-80, 91, 124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic) and Pain, Opioids.

Decision rationale: ODG does not recommend the use of opioids for low back pain "except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." The patient has exceeded the 2 week recommended treatment length for opioid usage. MTUS does not discourage use of opioids past 2 weeks, but does state that "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." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. The quantity requested is in excess of recommendations. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Neurology follow-up visit: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints, Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints, Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007), Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints.

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

Decision rationale: MTUS is silent regarding visits to a neurology specialist. ODG states, "Recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self-care as soon as clinically feasible." There is no medical documentation showing the reason for the follow up and the plan for how the visit will improve the diagnosis and care for the employee. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

