

Case Number:	CM15-0097425		
Date Assigned:	05/28/2015	Date of Injury:	11/15/2012
Decision Date:	06/26/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/01/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/20/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 58-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 11/15/2012. Current diagnoses include headache, cervicgia, right shoulder pain, right shoulder sprain/strain, left shoulder pain, and left shoulder sprain/strain. Previous treatments included medication management, psychotherapy, hypotherapy, right shoulder surgery, physical therapy, epidural injection, and acupuncture. Previous diagnostic studies include urine drug screening. Initial injuries occurred to the head, neck, arms, hands, shoulders, and left lower extremity when a piece of metal hit his head causing him to lose consciousness. Report dated 04/16/2015 noted that the injured worker presented with complaints that included constant severe throbbing headaches, neck pain and stiffness, right shoulder pain, and left shoulder pain and weakness. Pain level was not included. Physical examination was positive for increased head pain, decreased cervical range of motion with pain, tenderness to palpation of the cervical paravertebral muscles, cervical compression causes pain, foraminal compression causes pain bilaterally, decreased right and left shoulder range of motion, tenderness to palpation of the anterior shoulder and posterior shoulder, supraspinatus press causes pain, and shoulder apprehension causes pain. The treatment plan included requests for Tramadol ER and MRI for both shoulders and neck due to ongoing pain in both shoulders and neck, therefore needing more diagnostic studies to determine extent of the injured worker's ongoing symptoms. Disputed treatments include Tramadol ER, cervical MRI, and bilateral shoulder MRI.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol ER (extended release) 100mg, #45 (one orally every day): Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids
Page(s): 76-84.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management Actions Should Include: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: 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. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or nonadherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor-shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids; (a) If the patient has returned to work. (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. These criteria have been met in the provided clinical documentation and therefore the request is medically necessary.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the cervical spine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Neck Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173-174.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag. Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery. Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. The provided progress notes fails to show any documentation of indications for imaging studies of the neck as outlined above per the ACOEM. There was no emergence of red flag. The neck pain was characterized as unchanged. The physical exam noted no evidence of new tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no planned invasive procedure. Therefore, criteria have not been met for a MRI of the neck and the request is not medically necessary.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the bilateral shoulders: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Shoulder Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 9 Shoulder Complaints Page(s): 208.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on shoulder complaints and imaging studies states: Primary criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag (e.g., indications of intra-abdominal or cardiac problems presenting as shoulder problems). Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurovascular dysfunction (e.g., cervical root problems presenting as shoulder pain, weakness from a massive rotator cuff tear, or the presence of edema, cyanosis or Raynaud's phenomenon). Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery. Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure (e.g., a full thickness rotator cuff tear not responding to conservative treatment). The provided documentation for review fails to meet the above criteria per the ACOEM. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.