

Case Number:	CM15-0192502		
Date Assigned:	10/06/2015	Date of Injury:	06/04/2013
Decision Date:	11/19/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/04/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/30/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 31 year old female who sustained an industrial injury 06-04-13. A review of the medical records reveals the injured worker is undergoing treatment for bilateral epicondylitis. Medical records (08-25-15) reveal the injured worker states "still doing the same. Back to work." There is no description or rating of pain. The physical exam (08-26-15) reveals tenderness to palpation to the bilateral lateral epicondyles, increased muscle tension in the bilateral volar proximal muscles. Prior treatment includes medications. The treating provider (08-26-15) reports the plan is Tramadol, Meloxicam, and gabapentin. The original utilization review (09-04-15) non certified the request for Soma 350mg #30 and Tramadol 50mg #90. The documentation supports that the was on Soma on 05-19-15, but there is no documentation that the injured worker was ever on Tramadol.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Soma 350mg, #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Carisoprodol (Soma).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain), Carisoprodol (Soma). Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Soma (Carisoprodol).

Decision rationale: Soma is the brand name version of the muscle relaxant carisoprodol. MTUS guidelines state that Soma is "Not recommended. This medication is not indicated for long-term use." MTUS continues by discussing several severe abuse, addiction, and withdrawal concerns regarding Soma. Soma is not recommended for longer than a 2 to 3 week period and that weaning of medication should occur, according to MTUS. The request for Soma 350mg #30 is in excess of the guidelines. The medical documentation provided does not indicate objective functional improvement with the use of this medication. As such, the request for Soma 350mg, #30 is not medically necessary.

Tramadol 50mg, #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids, specific drug list.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids, specific drug list. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®).

Decision rationale: Tramadol is classified as a 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. MTUS states that "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." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. As such, the request for Tramadol 50mg, #90 is not medically necessary.