

Case Number:	CM15-0088676		
Date Assigned:	05/12/2015	Date of Injury:	12/01/2004
Decision Date:	06/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/23/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/08/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 50 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/1/2004. He reported back pain after a motor vehicle accident. Diagnoses have included low back pain, failed back syndrome, bilateral lumbar radiculitis, right shoulder pain, right rotator cuff syndrome, right lateral epicondylitis, bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, cervical degenerative disc disease, chronic pain, cervical radiculopathy and cervical spondylosis. Treatment to date has included lumbar surgery, carpal tunnel release and medication. According to the progress report dated 4/3/2015, the injured worker complained of aching pain in his right elbow and forearm. He also complained of testicular pain. He complained of right shoulder pain, low back pain, neck pain, upper back pain and bilateral leg pain. He complained of numbness in the last two digits of both hands. He complained of a tingling and burning sensation in his thighs, especially after standing for a long period of time. He reported that his knees buckled, left worse than right. Physical exam revealed tenderness over the right lateral epicondyle and right common extensor tendon. There was limited active range of motion of both shoulders. There was tenderness over the right lower lumbar paraspinal muscles and tenderness and tightness over the upper trapezius muscles and cervical paraspinal muscles. Authorization was requested for Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, ongoing management Page(s): 78.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. 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. According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 5mg #90 is not medically necessary.