

Case Number:	CM15-0003650		
Date Assigned:	01/14/2015	Date of Injury:	04/19/2010
Decision Date:	03/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/08/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/07/2015

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: Maryland, Texas, Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Allergy and Immunology, Rheumatology

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 57 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 4/19/10. She has reported pain in the back with radiation to the legs. The diagnoses have included lumbar radiculopathy, herniated lumbar disc and degenerative disc disease . Treatment to date has included physical therapy, acupuncture, lumbar epidural injections, oral and topical medications. As of the PR2 on 11/24/14, the injured worker reported lumbar back pain. The treating physician is requesting to continue current medications including Tramadol and Medrox patches. No documentation in the case file as to the dosage and strength of medications. On 12/8/14 Utilization Review non-certified a prescription for Tramadol and Medrox patches. The UR physician cited the MTUS chronic pain medical treatment guidelines. On 1/7/15, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of Tramadol and Medrox patches.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 94,78;79-80;124.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Tramadol, Ultram Page(s): 74-96, 113, 123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram; ½)

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol that "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/acetaminophen." "The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. The original utilization review recommended weaning and modified the request, which is appropriate. The quantity is not specified. As such, the request for tramadol is not medically necessary.

Medrox patches: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Salicylate topicals Page(s): 105;112-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Pain, Compound creams

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommend usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." This is a patch with methyl salicylate, menthol and capsaicin. MEDROX LOTION/OINTMENT/PATCHES (NOT RECOMMENDED) The Medrox patches contain topical menthol, capsaicin, and salicylate. ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." MTUS recommends topical capsaicin "only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments." There is no indication that the patient has failed oral medication or is intolerant to other treatments. ODG only comments on menthol in the context of cryotherapy for acute pain, but does state "Topical OTC pain relievers that contain menthol, methyl salicylate, or capsaicin, may in rare instances cause serious burns, a new alert from the FDA warns." MTUS states regarding topical Salicylate, "Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004) See also Topical analgesics; & Topical analgesics, compounded." In this case, topical

capsaicin is not supported for topical use per guidelines. As such, the request for Medrox is not medically necessary.