

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0069518		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/16/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/12/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/13/2015

### 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: Maryland, Texas, Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Allergy and Immunology, Rheumatology

### 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 39 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 02/16/2012. The injured worker is currently diagnosed as having clinically consistent lumbar radiculopathy, lumbar facetal pain, sacroiliitis, and lumbar degenerative disc disease. Treatment and diagnostics to date has included lumbar MRI, electromyography/nerve conduction studies of bilateral lower extremities, and medications. In a progress note dated 02/20/2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of persistent lower back and right hip pain. The treating physician reported requesting authorization for lumbar MRI, Ultram ER, and Flector patch.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) of the lumbar spine:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 287-315. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), MRIs (magnetic resonance imaging).

**Decision rationale:** MTUS and ACOEM recommend MRI, in general, for low back pain when "cauda equine, tumor, infection, or fracture are strongly suspected and plain film radiographs are negative, MRI test of choice for patients with prior back surgery." ACOEM additionally recommends against MRI for low back pain "before 1 month in absence of red flags." ODG states, "Imaging is indicated only if they have severe progressive neurologic impairments or signs or symptoms indicating a serious or specific underlying condition, or if they are candidates for invasive interventions. Immediate imaging is recommended for patients with major risk factors for cancer, spinal infection, cauda equina syndrome, or severe or progressive neurologic deficits. Imaging after a trial of treatment is recommended for patients who have minor risk factors for cancer, inflammatory back disease, vertebral compression fracture, radiculopathy, or symptomatic spinal stenosis. Subsequent imaging should be based on new symptoms or changes in current symptoms." The patient has a previous MRI of the lumbar spine 04/18/14. The medical notes provided did not document (physical exam, objective testing, or subjective complaints) any red flags, significant worsening in symptoms or other findings suggestive of the pathologies outlined in the above guidelines. As such, the request for MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) of the lumbar spine is not medically necessary.

**Flector Patch 1.3%, one to skin every 12 hours, #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS and ODG recommend usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details "primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed." The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, "There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." The MTUS does not address Flector patches which contain diclofenac but does discuss Voltaren gel. VOLTAREN (DICLOFENAC) (RECOMMENDED FOR OA) MTUS specifically states for Voltaren Gel 1% (diclofenac) that is it "Indicated for relief of osteoarthritis pain in joints that lend themselves to topical treatment (ankle, elbow, foot, hand, knee, and wrist). It has not been evaluated for treatment of the spine, hip or shoulder." Medical records do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis pain in the joints. Additionally, the records indicate that the treatment area would be for lower back. As such, the request for Flector Patch 1.3%, one to skin every 12 hours, #60 IS NOT medically necessary.

**Ultram Extended Release 100mg, one by mouth every day, twice a day, #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-112.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Tramadol, Ultram Page(s): 74-96, 113,123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram<sup>®</sup> 1/2).

**Decision rationale:** Tramadol is classified as a central acting synthetic opioids. 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." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. MTUS states that "ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, intensity of pain after taking opioid, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Also, the medical records state that the patient has not had any improvement on the short acting form of this medication, there is no evidence that patient would be better on the long acting form of the same drug. As such, the request for Ultram Extended Release 100mg, one by mouth every day, twice a day, #60 is not medically necessary.