

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0119955 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 06/30/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 03/31/2000 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 07/29/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 06/04/2015 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 06/22/2015 |

### 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 52 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/31/2000. Initial complaints and diagnosis were not clearly documented. On provider visit dated 05/27/2015 the injured worker has reported right side low back pain with radicular symptoms. On examination of the lumbar spine revealed positive straight leg raise in the right, and palpable twitch positive trigger points are noted on the lumbar paraspinal muscles. Gait was antalgic. The diagnoses have included chronic low back pain with pain radicular symptom. Treatment to date has included medication, laboratory studies and injection. There was no clear evidence of any significant reduction in pain level or improvement in functional capacity noted. The provider requested Norco and Prilosec.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325mg quantity 240:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen; Opioids.

**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's 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 10/325mg #240 is not medically necessary.

**Prilosec 20mg quantity 30 with one refill:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation National Guideline Clearinghouse.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient has GI issue that requires the use of prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, Prilosec 20mg #30 prescription with 1 refill is not medically necessary..