

Case Number:	CM15-0083681		
Date Assigned:	05/05/2015	Date of Injury:	07/30/2014
Decision Date:	06/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/01/2015

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: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 male who sustained an industrial injury on July 30, 2014. He has reported constant pain in the cervical spine and has been diagnosed with joint derangement not otherwise specified-shoulder, lumbar disc displacement, and cervical disc displacement. Treatment has included medications. Currently there was constant pain in the low back and bilateral shoulders. Examination of the lumbar spine showed tenderness with spasm. Range of motion was guarded and restricted. Examination of the shoulder showed there was tenderness around the anterior glenohumeral region and subacromial space. There was reducible symptomology with internal rotation and forward flexion. The treatment plan included cyclobenzaprine and tramadol.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride 7.5mg QTY: 120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Cyclobenzaprine a non sedating muscle relaxants is recommended with caution as a second line option for short term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic spasm and pain. Efficacy appears to diminish over time and prolonged use may cause dependence. The guidelines do not recommend to be used for more than 2-3 weeks. The patient in this case has been using Cyclobenzaprine without evidence of spasm's relief or functional improvement. Therefore, the request for Cyclobenzaprine hydrochloride 7.5mg #120 is not medically necessary.

Tramadol ER 150mg QTY: 90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 113.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Ultram (Tramadol) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework. Although, Tramadol may be needed to help with the patient pain, there is no clear evidence of objective and recent functional and pain improvement from its previous use. There is no clear documentation of the efficacy/safety of previous use of tramadol. There is no recent evidence of objective monitoring of compliance of the patient with his medications. Therefore, the prescription of TRAMADOL ER 150 mg #90 is not medically necessary.