

Case Number:	CM15-0214192		
Date Assigned:	11/04/2015	Date of Injury:	02/01/2011
Decision Date:	12/15/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/30/2015

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: 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 was a 39 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury, February 1, 2011. The injured worker was undergoing treatment for bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, epicondylitis and chronic pain. According to progress note of September 30, 2015, the injured worker's chief complaint was bilateral wrist pain. The injured worker continued to work full time at regular duties. The objective findings were tenderness along the wrist bilaterally at the CMC and STT joint. The injured worker was unable to make a fist bilaterally as well as pain across on the pinky finger on the right with mild swelling. The injured worker previously received the following treatments TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulator) unit, wrist bracing, Nalfon, Gabapentin, Naproxen, Protonix and Tramadol ER 150mg since December 2014. The RFA (request for authorization) dated September 30, 2015; the following treatments were requested a prescription for Tramadol ER 150mg. The UR (utilization review board) denied certification on October 9, 2015; for a prescription for Tramadol ER 150mg.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol Extended release 150mg quantity 30: Upheld

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

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 / Opioids for chronic pain.

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. The ODG-TWC pain section comments specifically on criteria for the use of drug screening for ongoing opioid treatment. The ODG Pain / Opioids for chronic pain states "According to a major NIH systematic review, there is insufficient evidence to support the effectiveness of long-term opioid therapy for improving chronic pain, but emerging data support a dose-dependent risk for serious harms." In this case, there is insufficient evidence in the records of 9/30/15 of failure of primary over the counter non-steroids or moderate to severe pain to warrant Tramadol. Based upon the records reviewed there is insufficient evidence to support chronic use of narcotics. There is lack of demonstrated functional improvement, percentage of relief, demonstration of urine toxicology compliance, return to work, or increase in activity. Therefore, use of Tramadol is not medically necessary and it is non-certified.