

Case Number:	CM15-0076187		
Date Assigned:	04/28/2015	Date of Injury:	09/10/2014
Decision Date:	06/08/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/22/2015

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 (IW) is a 28-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury to the lower back on 09/10/2014. Diagnoses include traumatic musculoligamentous strain of the lumbar spine and history of left leg and thoracic spine radiculitis. Treatment to date has included medications and physical therapy. MRI of the lumbar spine from 11/11/14 showed mild to moderate facet joint hypertrophy and spinal stenosis at L3-4 and L4-5. According to the progress notes dated 3/30/15, the IW reported lower back pain radiating up the thoracic spine region and down to the left knee. On examination, there was tenderness at the lumbar paravertebral muscles with spasms and guarding. A request was made for Tramadol 50mg, #60 and Zantac 150mg, #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 50mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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 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 tramadol is not medically necessary.

Zantac 150mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines x 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 68-69 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for ranitidine (Zantac), California MTUS states that H2 receptor antagonists are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested ranitidine (Zantac) is not medically necessary.