

Case Number:	CM15-0111612		
Date Assigned:	06/18/2015	Date of Injury:	01/22/1997
Decision Date:	07/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/09/2015

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

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 46-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 1/22/1997. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having low back pain, lumbar sprain/strain with degenerative joint disease Alzheimer's disease facet arthrosis and right short leg with altered body mechanics with worsening back pain, depression and migraines. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 4/1/2015, the injured worker complains of ongoing low back pain that radiated to the bilateral lower extremities. Physical examination showed palpable spasm with decreased lumbar range of motion with sensory loss in the right lower extremity. Medications are documented to provide 50% pain relief, with no pain rating documented. Documentation states the urine drug screens are appropriate. The treating physician is requesting Mobic 15 mg #30 and Tramadol ER 200 mg #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Mobic 15mg quantity 30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non Steroidal Anti Inflammatory Drugs.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), Page 22.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatories are the traditional first line of treatment, to reduce pain so activity and functional restoration can resume, but long-term use may not be warranted. Monitoring of NSAID's functional benefit is advised as per Guidelines, long-term use of NSAIDS beyond a few weeks may actually retard muscle and connective tissue healing and increase the risk for heart attack and stroke in patients with or without heart disease, as well as potential for hip fractures even within the first weeks of treatment, increasing with longer use and higher doses of the NSAID. Available reports submitted have not adequately addressed the indication to continue a NSAID for a chronic injury nor have they demonstrated any functional efficacy derived from treatment already rendered. The Mobic 15mg quantity 30 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Tramadol extended release 200mg quantity 30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Tramadol extended release 200mg quantity 30 is not medically necessary and appropriate.