

Case Number:	CM15-0087444		
Date Assigned:	05/11/2015	Date of Injury:	03/25/2013
Decision Date:	06/12/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/10/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/06/2015

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: Family Practice

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 41 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 3/25/13. The injured worker was diagnosed as having degeneration of lumbar intervertebral disc, lumbar radiculopathy, osteoarthritis of spinal facet joint, spinal stenosis of lumbar region, neck pain and lumbar post-laminectomy syndrome. Treatment to date has included lumbar micro hemilaminotomy and foraminotomy of L4-5; oral medications including Percocet, Flexeril, Ibuprofen, MS Contin, Trazadone and Prilosec; lumbar epidural steroidal injections, physical therapy and home exercise program. (MRI) magnetic resonance imaging of lumbar spine performed on 5/10/13 revealed L3-4 mild paracentral disc protrusion, l4 nerve impingement, right lateral recess stenosis, L4-5 right paracentral disc protrusion with cephalad extension, L5-S1 mild disc bulge and facet joint arthrosis at L3-4, L4-5 and L5-S1. Currently, the injured worker complains of continued low back pain rated 10/10 without medications and 5/10 with medications. The injured worker notes pain medication keeps pain at a manageable level to complete necessary activities of daily living. Physical exam noted restricted range of motion of cervical spine and restricted range of motion of lumbar spine with dysesthesia shooting down the right leg and left leg dysesthesia from left hip to groin to calf. A request for authorization was submitted for MS Contin 15mg and Percocet 10/325mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MS Contin 15mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids
Page(s): 76-78, 80.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the long-term use of opioids, including MS Contin. These guidelines have established criteria on the use of opioids for the ongoing management of pain. Actions should include: prescriptions from a single practitioner and from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. There should be an 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. There should be evidence of documentation of the 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring. These four domains include: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychological functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. Further, there should be consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain that does not improve on opioids in 3 months. There should be consideration of an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse (Pages 76-78). Finally, the guidelines indicate that for chronic back pain, the long-term efficacy of opioids is unclear. Failure to respond to a time-limited course of opioids has led to the suggestion of reassessment and consideration of alternative therapy (Page 80). Based on the review of the medical records, there is insufficient documentation in support of these stated MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines for the ongoing use of opioids. There is insufficient documentation of the 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring. The treatment course of opioids in this patient has extended well beyond the time frame required for a reassessment of therapy. In summary, there is insufficient documentation to support the chronic use of an opioid in this patient. Treatment with MS Contin is not considered as medically necessary. In the Utilization Review process it should be noted that a limited supply of MS Contin was approved for weaning purposes. This is consistent with the MTUS recommendations. The request is not medically necessary.

Percocet 10/325mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids
Page(s): 76-78, 80.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the long-term use of opioids, including Percocet. These guidelines have established criteria on the use of opioids for the ongoing management of pain. Actions should include: prescriptions from a single practitioner and from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. There should be an 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. There should be evidence of documentation of the 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring. These four domains include: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychological functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. Further, there should be consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain that does not improve on opioids in 3 months. There should be consideration of an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse (Pages 76-78). Finally, the guidelines indicate that for chronic back pain, the long-term efficacy of opioids is unclear. Failure to respond to a time-limited course of opioids has led to the suggestion of reassessment and consideration of alternative therapy (Page 80). Based on the review of the medical records, there is insufficient documentation in support of these stated MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines for the ongoing use of opioids. There is insufficient documentation of the 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring. The treatment course of opioids in this patient has extended well beyond the time frame required for a reassessment of therapy. In summary, there is insufficient documentation to support the chronic use of an opioid in this patient. Treatment with Percocet is not considered as medically necessary. In the Utilization Review process, it should be noted that a limited supply of Percocet was approved to allow for weaning. This is consistent with the MTUS recommendations. The request is not medically necessary.