

Case Number:	CM15-0027103		
Date Assigned:	02/19/2015	Date of Injury:	03/30/2011
Decision Date:	03/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/13/2015

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, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & Gen Prev Med

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 61 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 3/30/11. The injured worker reported symptoms in the back and left upper extremity. The diagnoses included cervical disc protrusion, cervical sprain/strain, and displacement of cervical intervertebral disc without myelopathy, lumbago, left shoulder pain, osteoarthritis, shoulder, and sprain of unspecified site of shoulder and upper arm and left shoulder pain. Treatments to date include oral pain medications and activity modifications. In a progress note dated 1/13/15 the treating provider reports the injured worker was with "frequent severe to 9/10 dull headache...dull neck pain...dull low back pain radiating to bilateral shoulder...dull left shoulder pain radiating to left arm with weakness...dull left elbow pain...". On 1/13/15 Utilization Review non-certified the request for Tramadol extended release 100 milligrams quantity of 45 and urine toxicology. The MTUS, ACOEM Guidelines, (or ODG) was cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol ER 100mg #45: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Tramadol, Ultram Page(s): page(s) 74-96, 113, 123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram®)

Decision rationale: Ultram is the brand name version of tramadol, which is classified as 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. The medical documentation indicates that the patient has been on Tramadol for 5 months, which is in excess of guidelines. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. As such, the request for Tramadol ER 100mg #45 is not medically necessary.

Urine toxicology: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids and Substance abuse, Page(s): page(s) 74-96;108-109. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation University of Michigan Health System Guidelines for Clinical Care: Managing Chronic Non-terminal Pain, Including Prescribing Controlled Substances (May 2009), pg 32 Established Patients Using a Controlled Substance

Decision rationale: MTUS states that use of urine drug screening for illegal drugs should be considered before therapeutic trial of opioids are initiated. Additionally, "Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion) would indicate need for urine drug screening. There is insufficient documentation provided to suggest issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control by the treating physician. University of Michigan Health System Guidelines for Clinical Care: Managing Chronic Non-terminal Pain, Including Prescribing Controlled Substances (May 2009) recommends for stable patients without red flags 'twice yearly urine drug screening for all chronic non-malignant pain patients receiving opioids' once during January-June and another July-December." The patient has been on chronic opioid therapy. The treating physician has not indicated why a urine drug screen is necessary at this time and has provided no evidence of red flags. As such, the request for Urine toxicology is not medically necessary.

