

Case Number:	CM14-0202475		
Date Assigned:	12/15/2014	Date of Injury:	04/20/2009
Decision Date:	02/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/10/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/04/2014

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 Family Practice and is licensed to practice in Colorado. 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:

68 year old male with date of injury 4/20/2009 continues care with the treating physicians. The mechanism of work-related injury is not specified. Patient has ongoing low back pain, right hip pain, and bilateral knee pain. He has tried chiropractic therapies, physical therapy, injections and medications with variable relief. Medical records show decreased range of motion in lumbar spine (40/90 degrees flexion, 10/25 degrees extension, 15/25 lateral flexion right and left), and decreased flexion of the knees, 100/130 degrees. Patient's pain is rated fairly consistently in the records as 8-9/10 low back pain, 5-6/10 right hip pain, 5/10 right knee pain, and 8-9/10 left knee pain without significant variation. Patient is currently maintained on medications including Ultracet and refills have been requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ultracet 37.5/325mg #90 with 2 additional refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pain Interventions and Treatments Page(s): 79-80, 85, 88-89, and 93.

Decision rationale: Tramadol is a synthetic opioid that exerts its effect on the central nervous system. The MTUS Guidelines establish criteria for use of opioids, including long term use (6 months or more). When managing patients using long term opioids, the following should be addressed: Re-assess the diagnosis and review previous treatments and whether or not they were helpful. When re-assessing, pain levels and improvement in function should be documented. Pain levels should be documented every visit. Function should be evaluated every 6 months using a validated clinical assessment tool. Adverse effects, including hyperalgesia, should also be addressed each visit. Patient's motivation and attitudes about pain / work / interpersonal relationships can be examined to determine if patient requires psychological evaluation as well. Aberrant / addictive behavior should be addressed if present. Do not decrease dose if effective. Medication for breakthrough pain may be helpful in limiting overall medication. Follow up evaluations are recommended every 1-6 months. To summarize the above, the 4A's of Drug Monitoring (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug-taking Behaviors) have been established. The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. Several circumstances need to be considered when determining to discontinue opioids: 1) Verify patient has not had failure to improve because of inappropriate dosing or under-dosing of opioids. 2) Consider possible reasons for immediate discontinuation including diversion, prescription forgery, illicit drug use, and suicide attempt, arrest related to opioids and aggressive or threatening behavior in clinic. Weaning from the medication over 30 day period, under direct medical supervision, is recommended unless a reason for immediate discontinuation exists. If a medication contract is in place, some physicians will allow one infraction without immediate discontinuation, but the contract and clinic policy should be reviewed with patient and consequences of further violations made clear to patient. 3) Consider discontinuation if there has been no improvement in overall function, or a decrease in function. 4) Patient has evidence of unacceptable side effects. 5) Patient's pain has resolved. 6) Patient exhibits "serious non-adherence" or misuse. Per the Guidelines, Chelminski defines "serious substance misuse" as meeting any of the following criteria: (a) cocaine or amphetamines on urine toxicology screen (positive cannabinoid was not considered serious substance abuse); (b) procurement of opioids from more than one provider on a regular basis; (c) diversion of opioids; (d) urine toxicology screen negative for prescribed drugs on at least two occasions (an indicator of possible diversion); & (e) urine toxicology screen positive on at least two occasions for opioids not routinely prescribed. 7) Patient requests discontinuing opioids. 8) Consider verifying that patient is in consultation with physician specializing in addiction to consider detoxification if patient continues to violate the medication contract or shows other signs of abuse / addiction. 9) Document the basis for decision to discontinue opioids. Likewise, when making the decision to continue opioids long term, consider the following: Has patient returned to work? Has patient had improved function and decreased pain with the opioids? For the patient of concern, general statements regarding patient's pain relief and ability to function on medications are documented in clinic notes. There is no objective assessment of function and no actual documented change in pain ratings as they are always similar. There is also no documentation that patient has been evaluated for aberrant drug taking behavior or monitored as the Guidelines recommend with the "4 A's." As there is no documented efficacy or improved function and no evidence that monitoring is ongoing, the request for Ultracet is not medically necessary.