

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0197890		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/08/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/18/2009
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/12/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/25/2014

### 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 Rehab, has a subspecialty in Pain Management 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 male patient with the date of injury of November 18, 2009. A Utilization Review dated November 12, 2014 recommended non-certification of urine tox screen - retro and Neurontin 600 mg #90 and modification of Ultram 50 mg #60 to Ultram 50 mg #30. A Urine Drug Test was done on August 19, 2013. A Progress Report dated October 1, 2014 identifies Subjective Complaints of bilateral elbow and hand pain. Objective Findings identify decreased grip bilaterally and positive Tinel's bilateral elbow. Diagnoses identify GERD resolved, s/p revision right lateral epicondylar repair, and s/p extension carpi radialis tendon. Treatment Plan identifies urine tox screen, Ultram 50mg, and Neurontin 600mg.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Retro urine tox screen:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 76-79, 99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, Urine Drug Testing

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for retro urine tox screen, CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug related behaviors. ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, it appears the patient is taking controlled substance medication. The patient recently underwent a urine drug screen. There is no documentation of risk stratification to identify the medical necessity of drug screening at the proposed frequency. Additionally, there is no documentation that the physician is concerned about the patient misusing or abusing any controlled substances. In light of the above issues, the currently requested retro urine tox screen is not medically necessary.

**Ultram 50mg #60:** Upheld

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

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

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Ultram (tramadol), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Ultram 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 Ultram (tramadol) is not medically necessary.

**Neurontin 600mg #90:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 16-21.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding request for Gabapentin (Neurontin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that antiepilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that after initiation of treatment, there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as

documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Additionally, there is no discussion regarding side effects from this medication. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.