

Case Number:	CM14-0172188		
Date Assigned:	12/15/2014	Date of Injury:	01/14/2004
Decision Date:	01/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/17/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/17/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

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 is a patient with a date of injury of 1/14/04. A utilization review determination dated 9/17/14 recommends non-certification of lidocaine patches and modification of tramadol ER. 9/5/14 medical report identifies Zorvolex not helping as much with pain. Patient has pain radiating down both legs with numbness and tingling of both feet and legs. Home lumbar traction unit helps some with back function. On exam, there is tenderness and a positive left SLR. Recommendations include lumbar traction, muscle stimulator, Zorvolex, Nucynta ER, Lidocaine patches, PT, and lumbar ESI. 8/8/14 medical report identifies that the medications help with pain control except tramadol ER. On exam, there is tenderness and positive left SLR. Recommendations include lumbar traction, Zorvolex, tramadol ER, lidocaine patches, PT, and ESI.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol ER 150mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for tramadol ER, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested tramadol ER is not medically necessary.

Lidocaine 4% patches: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 111-113 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for lidocaine patches, CA MTUS states that topical lidocaine is "Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica)." Additionally, it is supported only as a dermal patch. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication of localized peripheral neuropathic pain, failure of first-line therapy, and efficacy from prior use of the medication. Given all of the above, the requested lidocaine patches are not medically necessary.