

Case Number:	CM15-0058452		
Date Assigned:	04/03/2015	Date of Injury:	06/30/2014
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/24/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/27/2015

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 & 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 63 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 06/30/2014. Current diagnosis includes left second metatarsal fracture. Previous treatments included medication management physical therapy, walker, and home exercise program. Previous diagnostic studies include were not included. Report dated 09/25/2014 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included continued left foot pain. Pain level was not included. Physical examination was positive for abnormal findings. The treatment plan included encouraged to walk without the walker, request for physical therapy, and follow up in two weeks for recheck. Of note the documentation submitted did not contain any current medical records. Disputed treatments include Ultracet.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ultracet Qty 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Medications for chronic pain Page(s): 60.

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

Decision rationale: Ultracet is the brand name version of Tramadol and Tylenol. MTUS refers to Tramadol/Tylenol in the context of opioids usage for osteoarthritis "Short-term use: Recommended on a trial basis for short-term use after there has been evidence of failure of first-line non-pharmacologic and medication options (such as acetaminophen or NSAIDs) and when there is evidence of moderate to severe pain. Also recommended for a trial if there is evidence of contraindications for use of first-line medications. Weak opioids should be considered at initiation of treatment with this class of drugs (such as Tramadol, Tramadol/acetaminophen, hydrocodone and codeine), and stronger opioids are only recommended for treatment of severe pain under exceptional circumstances (oxymorphone, oxycodone, hydromorphone, fentanyl, morphine sulfate)." 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." No documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. The patient has been on tramadol since 2014 and medical notes do not indicate any improved objective/subjective findings over that duration of time. As such, the request for Ultracet #60 is not medically necessary.