

Case Number:	CM15-0081164		
Date Assigned:	05/01/2015	Date of Injury:	04/04/2009
Decision Date:	06/26/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/27/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

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 51-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 4/4/09. He reported low back and lower extremity injuries. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bilateral knee pain, neck sprain/strain, lumbar sprain/strain, shoulder sprain/strain and leg sprain/strain. Treatment to date has included oral medications including Topamax, Alprazolam and Ultracet, physical therapy and psychiatry consult. Currently, the injured worker complains of bilateral knee pain, head and neck pain and sleep disorder with stress. The injured worker states Alprazolam helps with stress. Physical exam noted decreased strength in bilateral knees. The treatment plan included follow up appoint, request for authorization for physical therapy, light 4 wheel walker, bilateral knee braces, Alprazolam, Ultracet and Topamax and a urine analysis for drug compliance.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Alprazolam 1mg Qty: 30.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20-9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 24 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, Benzodiazepines.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Xanax (Alprazolam), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the benzodiazepines are "Not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant." Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation identifying any objective functional improvement as a result of the use of the medication and no rationale provided for long-term use of the medication despite the CA MTUS recommendation against long-term use. Benzodiazepines should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Xanax (Alprazolam) is not medically necessary.

Topamax 50mg Qty: 60.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 21.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20-9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 16-21 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for topiramate (Topamax), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that antiepilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that after initiation of treatment, there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Additionally, there is no discussion regarding side effects from this medication. Antiepileptic drugs should not be abruptly discontinued but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request. As such, the currently requested topiramate (Topamax) is not medically necessary.

Urine analysis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 77-80, 94.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 ? 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 76-79 and 99 of 127. Decision

based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter Urine Drug Testing.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for a urine toxicology test (UDS), CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the drug testing is recommended as an option. Guidelines go on to recommend monitoring for the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug related behaviors. ODG recommends urine drug testing on a yearly basis for low risk patients, 2-3 times a year for moderate risk patients, and possibly once per month for high risk patients. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation that the patient is currently utilizing drugs of potential abuse (the medical necessity of tramadol has not been met), the date and results of prior testing, and current risk stratification to identify the medical necessity of drug screening at the proposed frequency. Additionally, there is no documentation that the physician is concerned about the patient misusing or abusing any controlled substances. In light of the above issues, the currently requested urine toxicology test is not medically necessary.

Ultram 50mg Qty: 60.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 78- 80, 93-94.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20-9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultram (tramadol), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Ultram (tramadol) is not medically necessary.