

Case Number:	CM15-0209338		
Date Assigned:	10/28/2015	Date of Injury:	05/08/2014
Decision Date:	12/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/26/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/23/2015

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, Oregon, Washington
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

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 male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5-8-2014. The medical records indicate that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for left gastrocnemius partial tear with residual tenderness, rule out cystic changes of the gastrocnemius, and left Achilles tendinitis. According to the progress report dated 9-4-2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of left ankle pain. On a subjective pain scale, he rates his pain 8 out of 10, which has increased from 6 out of 10 on the last visit. The physical examination of the left ankle reveals grade 1 to 2 tenderness to palpation, which has decreased from grade 2 to 3 on the last visit. The medications prescribed are Tramadol (since at least 1-7-2015) and Terocin patches. Previous diagnostic studies include x-rays and MRI studies. Treatments to date include medication management, walking boot, and physical therapy. Work status is described as temporarily totally disabled. The original utilization review (9-26-2015) partially approved a request for Tramadol 50mg #6 (original request was for #60). The request for Terocin patches #30 and, and urine toxicology screen is non-certified.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 50mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, specific drug list.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines pages 93-94, opioids specific drug list, Tramadol is a synthetic opioid affecting the central nervous system. Tramadol is indicated for moderate to severe pain. Tramadol (Ultram) is a centrally acting synthetic opioid analgesic and it is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic. Tramadol is considered a second line agent when first line agents such as NSAIDs fail. The guidelines advise against prescription to patients that at risk for suicide or addiction. A recent Cochrane review found that this drug decreased pain intensity, produced symptom relief and improved function for a time period of up to three months but the benefits were small (a 12% decrease in pain intensity from baseline). Adverse events often caused study participants to discontinue this medication, and could limit usefulness. There are no long-term studies to allow for recommendations for longer than three months. (Cepeda, 2006) Similar findings were found in an evaluation of a formulation that combines immediate-release vs. extended release Tramadol. Adverse effects included nausea, constipation, dizziness/vertigo and somnolence. (Burch, 2007) Guidelines recommend 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. In this case there is insufficient evidence in the records of 9/4/15 of failure of primary over the counter non-steroids or moderate to severe pain to warrant Tramadol. Therefore use of Tramadol is not medically necessary and it is noncertified.

Urine toxicology screen: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction.

Decision rationale: Per the CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines (Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction pages 94-95), use of urine toxicology is encouraged particularly when opioids are prescribed. It states, "Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction. The following are steps to avoid misuse of opioids, and in particular, for those at high risk of abuse: a) Opioid therapy contracts. See Guidelines for Pain Treatment Agreement. b) Limitation of prescribing and filling of prescriptions to one pharmacy. c) Frequent random urine toxicology screens." In this case there is insufficient evidence of chronic opioid use or evidence of drug misuse to warrant urine toxicology. Therefore the determination is for non-certification.

Terocin patches #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Topical Analgesics.

Decision rationale: Terocin is composed of methyl salicylate, capsaicin, menthol and lidocaine hydrochloride. Per the CA MTUS regarding topical analgesics, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Topical analgesics, page 111-112 “Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety, primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended.” CA MTUS guidelines state that Capsaicin, topical is “Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments.” The indications for this topical medication are as follows: “There are positive randomized studies with capsaicin cream in patients with osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic non-specific back pain, but it should be considered experimental in very high doses.” According to the CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 56 and 57, regarding Lidocaine, may be recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tri-cyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). This is not a first-line treatment and is only FDA approved for post-herpetic neuralgia. Further research is needed to recommend this treatment for chronic neuropathic pain disorders other than post-herpetic neuralgia. In this case the exam note from 9/4/15 demonstrates there is no evidence of failure of first line medications such as gabapentin or Lyrica. Additionally this patient does not have a diagnosis of post-herpetic neuralgia or neuropathic pain. In this case the current request does not meet CA MTUS guidelines and therefore the request is not medically necessary.