

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0095371		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/21/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/27/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/24/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/18/2015

### 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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 54 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on November 27, 2014. He reported neck, upper back, right shoulder, and bilateral elbow pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical sprain/strain, cervical radiculopathy, thoracic spine sprain/strain, and right shoulder sprain/strain. Diagnostic studies to date have included x-rays and urine drug screening. Treatment to date has included off work, physical therapy, and medications including pain, muscle relaxant, and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory. On December 17, 2014, the injured worker complains of neck, mid back, and right shoulder pain. The physical exam revealed decreased cervical, bilateral shoulder, right elbow, thoracic, and lumbar ranges of motion. The requested treatments include Norco, an MRI of the right elbow, and a urine drug screen.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco tab 5-325mg #60 days 30:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Norco tab 5-325mg #60 days 30 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**MRI right elbow:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 10 Elbow Disorders (Revised 2007) Page(s): Chapter Elbow Disorder, Special Studies and Diagnostic, pages 601-602.

**Decision rationale:** Criteria for ordering imaging studies such include Emergence of a red flag; Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction; Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery; Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination and electro diagnostic studies. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist; however, review of submitted medical reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication for the MRI with unchanged chronic symptoms without progressive deterioration of clinical findings, acute new injury or red-flag conditions since last imaging study. When the neurologic examination is less clear, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. The MRI right elbow is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Urine drug screen for DOS12/17/14:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing, page 43.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Guidelines, urine drug screening is recommended as an option before a therapeutic trial of opioids and for on-going management to differentiate issues of abuse, addiction, misuse, or poor pain control; none of which apply to this patient who has been prescribed long-term opioid this chronic injury. Presented medical reports from the provider have unchanged chronic severe pain symptoms with unchanged clinical findings of restricted range and tenderness without acute new deficits or red-flag condition changes. Treatment plan remains unchanged with continued medication refills without change in dosing or prescription for chronic pain. There is no report of aberrant behaviors, illicit drug use, and report of acute injury or change in clinical findings or risk factors to support frequent UDS. Documented abuse, misuse, poor pain control, history of unexpected positive results for a non-prescribed scheduled drug or illicit drug or history of negative results for prescribed medications may warrant UDS and place the patient in a higher risk level; however, none are provided. The Urine drug screen for DOS 12/17/14 is not medically necessary and appropriate.