MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0057095		
Date Assigned:	04/01/2015	Date of Injury:	07/05/2013
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/25/2015

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
Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency 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 male, who sustained an industrial injury on July 5, 2013. He reported back pain, knee pain and neck pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having synovitis, lumbago, cervicalgia, pain in joints, lower extremities and pigmented villonodular synovitis. Treatment to date has included radiographic imaging, diagnostic studies, and multiple surgical interventions of the left knee, physical therapy, toxicology screens, medications and work restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of back pain, knee pain and neck pain. The injured worker reported an industrial injury in 2013, resulting in the above noted pain. He was treated conservatively and surgically without complete resolution of the pain. Evaluation on February 24, 2015, revealed continued left knee pain. It was noted he used a crutch for ambulation. Pain medications were requested.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5/325mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 77 of 127.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, On-GoingManagement, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82 Page(s): 78-82.

Decision rationale: The requested Norco 5/325mg #60, is not medically necessary. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, On-Going Management, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82, recommend continued use of this opiate for the treatment of moderate to severe pain, with documented objective evidence of derived functional benefit, as well as documented opiate surveillance measures. The injured worker has the left knee pain. The treating physician has not documented VAS pain quantification with and without medications, duration of treatment, and objective evidence of derived functional benefit such as improvements in activities of daily living or reduced work restrictions or decreased reliance on medical intervention, nor measures of opiate surveillance including an executed narcotic pain contract or urine drug screening. The criteria noted above not having been met, Norco 5/325mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Tramadol 30mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, On-GoingManagement, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82, andTramadol, Page 113 Page(s): 113, 78-82.

Decision rationale: The requested Tramadol 30mg #30, is not medically necessary. CA MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, On-Going Management, Pages 78-80, Opioids for Chronic Pain, Pages 80-82, and Tramadol, Page 113, do not recommend this synthetic opioid as first-line therapy, and recommend continued use of opiates for the treatment of moderate to severe pain, with documented objective evidence of derived functional benefit, as well as documented opiate surveillance measures. The injured worker has the left knee pain. The treating physician has not documented failed first-line opiate trials, VAS pain quantification with and without medications, duration of treatment, and objective evidence of derived functional benefit such as improvements in activities of daily living or reduced work restrictions or decreased reliance on medical intervention, nor measures of opiate surveillance including an executed narcotic pain contract nor urine drug screening. The criteria noted above not having been met, Tramadol 30mg #30 is not medically necessary.