

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0116578		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/25/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/20/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/24/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/15/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/17/2015

### 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 42-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on January 20, 2014, incurring multiple injuries from a nineteen feet fall from a ladder into a pile of lumbar. The injured worker did lose consciousness. Computed tomography of the face revealed multiple fractures and a computed tomography of the cervical spine showed a fracture of the occipital bone, right maxillary sinus, and nasal bone. X rays of the chest revealed right rib fractures. Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the right knee revealed joint effusion, chondromalacia of the patella, and partial thickness tear of the cruciate ligament. XMRI of the left knee showed a meniscus tear, joint effusion and osteoarthritis. A brain Magnetic Resonance Imaging showed an area of encephalomalacia with no acute abnormality. He was diagnosed with head trauma, a skull fracture, neck sprain, back sprains, shoulder sprain, bilateral knee contusions, rib fractures, nasal fractures and right ocular and orbital fracture. Treatment included pain management, inpatient hospitalization, anti-inflammatory drugs, muscle relaxants, work restrictions, and neurological consultation. Currently, the injured worker complained of daily headaches, insomnia, and vertigo and memory loss. He complained of persistent chronic pain, decreased range of motion in all joints, facial pain, and depression. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included a prescription got Tylenol with Codeine #3.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Tylenol #3, 300/30 mg Qty 60: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Pain (chronic).

**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, Tylenol#3 (Tylenol with Codeine) as well as other short acting opioids are indicated for intermittent or breakthrough pain (page 75). It can be used in acute post operative pain. It is not recommended for chronic pain of long-term use as prescribed in this case. 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. 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." There is no documentation of reduction of pain and functional improvement with previous use of Tylenol #3. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tylenol #3. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medications. Therefore, the prescription of Tylenol#3 is not medically necessary.