

Case Number:	CM15-0068051		
Date Assigned:	04/15/2015	Date of Injury:	05/05/2003
Decision Date:	05/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/10/2015

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 55 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/05/2003. The documentation submitted for this review did not include the details regarding the initial injury or prior treatments to date. Diagnoses include right plantar fasciitis, status post right total knee arthroplasty with patella osteophytes and persistent pain. Currently, he complained of right foot and ankle pain documented as manageable with medication. On 2/12/15, the physical examination documented right knee with warmth to touch, crepitation, and tenderness. The right foot was tender over the plantar fascia. The plan of care included continuation of medication therapy, home exercise, and he was pending authorization of a psychological evaluation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ultram 40mg #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

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.

Voltaren 75mg #60 with 2 refills: Upheld

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

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): 67-72 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain Chapter, NSAIDs.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Voltaren (diclofenac), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that Naproxen is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale), or any objective functional improvement. Additionally, ODG recommends diclofenac as a 2nd line agent due to its side effect profile, and there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line NSAIDs. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Voltaren (diclofenac) is not medically necessary.