

Case Number:	CM15-0189589		
Date Assigned:	10/01/2015	Date of Injury:	01/05/2009
Decision Date:	11/13/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/25/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 60 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 01-05-2009. The injured worker was diagnosed as having osteoarthritis NOS left leg, disc NEC-NOS-lumbar and lumbosacral neuritis NOS. On medical records dated 07-02-2015 and 03-13-2015, subjective complaints were noted as neck pain, rated a 8 out of 10, low back pain 8 out of 10, bilateral knee pain 8 out 120 and numbness in right leg. Objective findings were noted as walks with a cane, lumbar spine revealed painful motion and spasm. Hands written notes on are difficult to decipher. Treatment to date included medication. The injured worker was noted to be permanent and stationary. Current medications were not listed on 03-13-2015 and 07-02-2015. The Utilization Review (UR) was dated 09-02-2015. A request Tramadol 50 mg #120 was submitted. The UR submitted for this medical review indicated that the request for Tramadol 50 mg #120 was non-certified.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 50 mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "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 non-adherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4 A's' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of tramadol nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the ongoing management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends discontinuing opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, medical necessity cannot be affirmed. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.