

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0062799		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/08/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/07/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/11/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/16/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/02/2015

### 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:

The injured worker is a 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on January 7, 2008. He reported injury to multiple body parts after a fall from a roof. The injured worker was diagnosed as having spondylosis lumbar, low back pain syndrome, compression fracture L4 vertebra, pain in hand joint, left knee pain, chronic depression and reflex sympathetic dystrophy of upper limb. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, injection, physical therapy, psychotherapy and medications. On March 9, 2015, the injured worker complained of pain in the left leg, right hand, left knee and bilateral low back. The frequency of pain was described as constant and the quality of the pain was sharp and electrical. The pain is made worse by lifting, sitting, bending, physical activity and twisting. The pain is made better with sleep, rest and medication. The pain is rated as a 4 on a 1-10 pain scale with medications and as a 10/10 on the pain scale without medications. The treatment plan included medications and an MRI of the lumbar spine.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Percocet 10/325mg #210: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 81, 78, 80, 48, 124, 94, 75.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 179.

**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 period of 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. There is no justification for the use of several narcotics. Therefore the prescription of Percocet 10/325mg, #210 is not medically necessary.

**MRI of the lumbar spine without contrast:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back, MRI.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 303.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the indications for imaging in case of back pain, MTUS guidelines stated: Lumbar spine x rays should not be recommended in patients with low back pain in the absence of red flags for serious spinal pathology, even if the pain has persisted for at least six weeks. However, it may be appropriate when the physician believes it would aid in patient management. Unequivocal objective findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging in patients who do not respond to treatment and who would consider surgery an option. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction should be

obtained before ordering an imaging study. Indiscriminant imaging will result in false-positive findings, such as disk bulges, that are not the source of painful symptoms and do not warrant surgery. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, the practitioner can discuss with a consultant the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, computer tomography [CT] for bony structures). Furthermore, and according to MTUS guidelines, MRI is the test of choice for patients with prior back surgery, fracture or tumors that may require surgery. The patient does not have any clear evidence of new lumbar nerve root compromise since his lumbar MRI of 2013. There is no clear evidence of significant change in the patient signs or symptoms suggestive of new pathology. Therefore, the request for lumbar MRI is not medically necessary.