

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0025796		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/19/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/01/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/12/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/11/2015

### 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, 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:

This 71-year-old male sustained a work related injury on 09/01/2002. According to a progress report dated 12/10/2014, the injured worker complained of posterior neck pain that was worse with prolonged activity. It was improved with rest. Diagnoses included status post previous anterior cervical fusion C5-6, 1997, status post anterior decompression and fusion C6-7 and C7-T1, 2003, degenerative disc disease at L4-5 and L5-S1, spondylolisthesis at L3-4 and C4-5 degenerative disc disease and disc herniation with stenosis. According to the provider, the urine drug screen of 10/30/2014 was consistent with medications. Tylenol #4 was prescribed for severe pain and Norflex for spasms. A urine toxicology report dated 10/30/2014 was submitted for review. On 01/12/2015, Utilization Review non-certified Tylenol #4, 2 refills. According to the Utilization Review physician, despite prior warning, the submitted record still failed to provide documentation of a risk assessment profile, attempt at weaning/tapering and an updated and signed pain contract between the provider and the claimant as well as evidence of objective functional benefit with prior opioid use. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines were referenced. The decision was appealed for an Independent Medical Review.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Tylenol #4 #90 with 2 refills: Upheld**

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

**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. There is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement with previous use of opioids (Tylenol). There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of Tylenol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medications. There is no clear justification for the need to continue the use of Tylenol. Therefore, the prescription of Tylenol #4 QTY: 90.00 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.