

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0216334		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	01/06/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/25/1999
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/04/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	12/04/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/24/2014

### 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, Michigan, 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 patient is a 48-year-old woman who sustained a work related injury on October 25, 1999. Subsequently, he developed chronic back pain. Prior treatments included lumbar spine surgery, spinal cord stimulator, and medications. According to a progress report dated November 24, 2014, the patient complained of increasing low back pain that radiates to the right leg in L5 distribution. The spinal cord stimulator misses part of the right leg. The patient reported that the medications helped 40% and rated the level of her pain as an 8-9/10. Physical examination revealed antalgic gait, decreased sensation in right posterolateral thigh, decreased strength right FHL, and straight leg raise test was positive on the right at 45 degrees and positive on the left at 60 degrees. Range of motion: 0 degrees with flexion, extension, right lateral, and left lateral. The patient was diagnosed with lumbar post laminectomy syndrome, chronic lumbar radiculopathy, and status post spinal cord stimulator implant.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Percocet 10/325mg #180:** Upheld

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

**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, 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. 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 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. The patient has been using opioids for long time without recent documentation of full control of pain and without any documentation of functional or quality of life improvement. There is no clear documentation of patient improvement in level of function, quality of life, adequate follow up for absence of side effects and aberrant behavior with a previous use of narcotics.