MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0075803		
Date Assigned:	04/27/2015	Date of Injury:	06/13/2006
Decision Date:	05/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/21/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 67 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/13/2006. Current diagnoses include shoulder pain-left and knee pain-right. Previous treatments included medication management, TENS unit, and home exercise program. Report dated 04/02/2014 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included knee and shoulder pain. Pain level was 3 out of 10 on the visual analog scale (VAS). Physical examination was positive for abnormal findings. The treatment plan included continue with current medications, encouraged to continue with home exercise program, self-care, and TENS, reviewed labs, and advised to continue follow up with family physician. Disputed treatments include Tramadol, TENS patch, and Lidopro cream.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 50mg #30: Upheld

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

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) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram).

Decision rationale: Tramadol is classified as a central acting synthetic opioid. 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. As such, the request for Tramadol 50mg #30 is not medically necessary.

TENS patch X 8 pairs: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS Page(s): 78.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee, Durable Medical Equipment (DME) and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines Medicare.gov, durable medial equipment.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ACOEM are silent regarding the medical necessity of TENS patches, but does address TENS unit. ODG does state regarding durable medical equipment (DME) recommended generally if there is a medical need and if the device or system meets Medicare's definition of durable medical equipment (DME) below and further details exercise equipment is considered not primarily medical in nature. Medicare details DME as:-durable and can withstand repeated use-used for a medical reason-not usually useful to someone who isn't sick or injured-appropriate to be used in your home. While TENs patches do meet criteria as durable medical equipment, the medical notes do not establish benefit from ongoing usage of a TENs unit. The treating physician does not include objective or subjective findings to substantiate additional TENs supplies. Given lack of documented improvement, the continued usage of TENs does not appear to be indicated and therefore the associated patches also do not appear to be indicated. As such, the request for TENS patch X 8 pairs is not medically necessary.

Lidopro cream 121 gm: Upheld

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

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 recommends 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 anti-depressants or anti-convulsants. 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." Lidopro is a topical medication containing Lidocaine, Capsaicin, Menthol, and Methyl Salicylate. ODG recommends 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 no indicate failure of anti-depressants or anti-convulsants. 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." MTUS recommends topical capsaicin only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. There is no indication that the patient has failed oral medication or is intolerant to other treatments. Additionally, ODG states "Topical OTC pain relievers that contain menthol, methyl salicylate, or capsaicin, may in rare instances cause serious burns, a new alert from the FDA warns." ODG only comments on menthol in the context of cryotherapy for acute pain, but does state "Topical OTC pain relievers that contain menthol, methyl salicylate, or capsaicin, may in rare instances cause serious burns, a new alert from the FDA warns." MTUS states regarding topical Salicylate, "Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004) See also Topical analgesics; & Topical analgesics, compounded." In this case, lidocaine is not supported for topical use per guidelines. As such, the request for Lidopro cream 121 gm is not medically necessary.