

Case Number:	CM15-0183577		
Date Assigned:	10/15/2015	Date of Injury:	10/31/2012
Decision Date:	12/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/18/2015

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: 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:

This injured worker is a 54 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10-31-2012. The injured worker was diagnosed as having right shoulder sprain - strain. On medical records dated 04-16-2015 and 08-12-2015, the subjective complaints were noted as right shoulder difficulty of overhead activity-gripping-grasping - pulling. And lower back pain with bilateral lower extremities numbness and tingling. No pain scaled was noted. Objective findings were noted as right shoulder tenderness to palpation, and positive impingement. Lumbar spine revealed tenderness to palpation, positive straight leg raise and positive Kemp's test. Treatments to date included home exercise, extracorporeal shockwave therapy, lumbar transforaminal epidural steroid injections and medication. Urine drug screen was performed on 10-21-2014 with normal and negative results noted. The injured worker was noted to be working modified duty. Current medications were listed as Norco, start Ultram and Voltaren, and Fexmid and refill Lyrica. The Utilization Review (UR) was dated 10-13-2012. A Request for Authorization was dated 08-14-2015. The UR submitted for this medical review indicated that the request for right shoulder ultrasound, Ultram ER 150mg #30, Fexmid 7.5mg #60 and random urine drug screen #1 was non-certified.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Right Shoulder Ultrasound: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Shoulder Complaints 2004.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Shoulder Complaints 2004, Section(s): Summary.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for shoulder ultrasound, California MTUS cites that ultrasonography for evaluation of rotator cuff is not recommended. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation of subjective/objective findings consistent with a condition/diagnosis for which ultrasound is supported given the lack of support for its use in the evaluation of the rotator cuff. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested shoulder ultrasound is not medically necessary.

Ultram ER 150mg, #30: 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: Regarding the request for Ultram ER, 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 prior opioid use has improved the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS) 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 Ultram ER is not medically necessary.

Fexmid 7.5mg, #60: 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): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Fexmid, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or

objective functional improvement as a result of the medication. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Fexmid is not medically necessary.

Random Urine Drug Screen # 1: 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, steps to avoid misuse/addiction. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter, Urine Drug Testing.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for a urine drug screen, CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug related behaviors. ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation of the date and results of prior testing and current risk stratification to identify the medical necessity of drug screening at the proposed frequency. Additionally, there is no documentation that the physician is concerned about the patient misusing or abusing any controlled substances. In light of the above issues, the currently requested urine drug screen is not medically necessary.