

Case Number:	CM14-0095207		
Date Assigned:	09/15/2014	Date of Injury:	05/14/1998
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/14/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/23/2014

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. 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, Pain Management

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 (IW) is a 60-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 05/14/1998. Diagnoses include sprains/strains of the knee and leg not otherwise specified. Treatment to date has included medications, physical and pool therapy, Synvisc injections and knee surgeries. Diagnostics performed to date included MRIs and x-rays. According to the PR2 dated 5/12/14, the IW reported knee pain. On examination, there was loss of range of motion. The IW had stated she cannot function on a daily basis without these medications. A request was made for Celebrex and Tramadol.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 150mg #60 with 5 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids (Long-Term Opioids (6 months or more)).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

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

Celebrex 200mg #30 with 5 refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 22 and 30 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for celecoxib (Celebrex), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Celebrex may be considered if the patient has a risk of GI complications, but not for the majority of patients. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a high risk of GI complications. There is no indication that Celebrex is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale) and no examples of objective functional improvement are provided. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested celecoxib (Celebrex) is not medically necessary.