

Case Number:	CM15-0142395		
Date Assigned:	08/03/2015	Date of Injury:	02/03/1992
Decision Date:	08/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/22/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency Medicine

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 59 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 2-3-1992. He has reported pain to the cervical spine and has been diagnosed with cervical radiculopathy, post cervical laminectomy syndrome, and spasm of muscle. Treatment has included medications, medical imaging, injections, and physical therapy. Range of motion of the cervical spine was restricted with flexion limited to 40 degrees, extension limited to 25 degrees, lateral rotation to the left limited to 15 degrees and lateral rotation to the right limited to 15 degrees. On examination of paravertebral muscles, tenderness was noted on both sides. Spurling's maneuver caused left upper extremity tingling. There was pain with left and right facet loading at the cervical spine. The treatment plan included tramadol and Ultram. The treatment request included tramadol and Ultram ER.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol HCL 50mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of Opioids.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, On-Going Management, Opioids for Chronic Pain, and Tramadol Page(s): 78-82, 113.

Decision rationale: The requested Tramadol HCL 50mg #60 is not medically necessary. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, On-Going Management, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82, and Tramadol, Page 113, do not recommend this synthetic opioid as first-line therapy, and recommend continued use of opiates for the treatment of moderate to severe pain, with documented objective evidence of derived functional benefit, as well as documented opiate surveillance measures. The treating physician has documented Spurling's maneuver caused left upper extremity tingling. There was pain with left and right facet loading at the cervical spine. The treating physician has not documented: failed first-line opiate trials, VAS pain quantification with and without medications, duration of treatment, objective evidence of derived functional benefit such as improvements in activities of daily living or reduced work restrictions or decreased reliance on medical intervention, nor measures of opiate surveillance including an executed narcotic pain contract nor urine drug screening. The criteria noted above not having been met, Tramadol HCL 50mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Ultram ER 100mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, On-Going Management, Opioids for Chronic Pain, and Tramadol Page(s): 78-82, 113.

Decision rationale: The requested Ultram ER 100mg #30, is not medically necessary. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, On-Going Management, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82, and Tramadol, Page 113, do not recommend this synthetic opioid as first-line therapy, and recommend continued use of opiates for the treatment of moderate to severe pain, with documented objective evidence of derived functional benefit, as well as documented opiate surveillance measures. The treating physician has documented Spurling's maneuver caused left upper extremity tingling. There was pain with left and right facet loading at the cervical spine. The treating physician has not documented: failed first-line opiate trials, VAS pain quantification with and without medications, duration of treatment, objective evidence of derived functional benefit such as improvements in activities of daily living or reduced work restrictions or decreased reliance on medical intervention, nor measures of opiate surveillance including an executed narcotic pain contract nor urine drug screening. The requested Ultram ER 100mg #30 is not medically necessary.