

Case Number:	CM15-0168846		
Date Assigned:	09/09/2015	Date of Injury:	09/12/2014
Decision Date:	10/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/27/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 53 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 09-12-2014. She has reported injury to the low back. The diagnoses have included lumbar facet joint pain L4-L5, L5-S1; lumbar facet joint arthropathy; chronic low back pain; right lumbar facet joint arthropathy-facet joint pain; lumbar sprain-strain; lumbar stenosis; lumbar degenerative disc disease; and right sacroiliac joint pain. Treatment to date has included medications, diagnostics, injection, physical therapy, and home exercise program. Medications have included Ibuprofen, Naproxen, Tramadol, Nabumetone, and Cyclobenzaprine. A progress note from the treating physician, dated 07-28-2015, documented a follow-up visit with the injured worker. The injured worker reported low back pain, right worse than left, with right buttock and right posterior thigh pain; exacerbating factors include prolonged sitting, standing, lifting, twisting, and lying down; and mitigating factors include lying on the stomach and using a lumbar support. It is noted in the documentation that the injured worker has failed physical therapy, non-steroidal anti-inflammatories, and conservative treatments. Objective findings included tenderness upon palpation of the right thoracic and lumbar paraspinal muscles overlying the bilateral L4-L5 and L5-S1 facet joint; lumbar ranges of motion were restricted by pain in all directions; lumbar extension was worse than lumbar flexion; lumbar discogenic provocative maneuvers were positive bilaterally; sacroiliac provocative maneuvers were positive on the right; and sensation is intact to light touch, pinprick, proprioception, and vibration in all limbs. The treatment plan has included the request for Ultram 50mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ultram 50mg: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). 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. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to nonopioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids (a) If the patient has returned to work, (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant decrease in objective pain measures such as VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measures of improvement of function. Therefore all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

