

Case Number:	CM15-0102996		
Date Assigned:	06/05/2015	Date of Injury:	01/07/2008
Decision Date:	08/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/28/2015

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 (IW) is a 72 year old female who sustained an industrial injury on 01/07/2008. She reported that a chair rolled out from under her when starting to sit down, and she landed hard on her buttocks and legs and injured her lumbar spine. The injured worker was diagnosed as having chronic low back pain; multilevel degenerative disc disease, pronounced L5-S1; and bilateral S1 radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included medications, and pain management. Currently, the injured worker complains of back and leg pain. She denies weakness, but she does have chronic low back and sacral pain radiating over her bilateral thighs and calves to the heels. The pain is constant and aching. The lumbar spine is tender to palpation. The physician is working with her to adjust her medications to improve her function. Lyrica does help some with the burning pain in the feet, but the increase has not really made a significant difference. She has taken Tramadol in the past and recalls it provided a relief of pain. She has a daily home exercise program, and is sleeping 4-5 hours per night. Requests for authorization were made for the following: 1. Lyrica 75 MG #60. 2. Ultracet 37.5 MG #75.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lyrica 75 MG #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lyrica
Page(s): 19.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Lyrica states: Pregabalin (Lyrica, no generic available) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and post herpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. This medication is designated as a Schedule V controlled substance because of its causal relationship with euphoria. (Blommel, 2007) This medication also has an anti-anxiety effect. Pregabalin is being considered by the FDA as treatment for generalized anxiety disorder and social anxiety disorder. In June 2007, the FDA announced the approval of pregabalin as the first approved treatment for fibromyalgia. (ICSI, 2007) (Tassone, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Eisenberg, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) (Stacey, 2008) The patient does not have the diagnoses of diabetic neuropathy, fibromyalgia or post herpetic neuropathy. There is no documentation of failure of other first line agents for peripheral neuropathy. Therefore, guideline recommendations have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Ultracet 37.5 MG #75: Upheld

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

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 4 A'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 "4 A'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 nonopioid 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. There is no documented significant decrease in objective pain measures such as VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measures of improvement of function. Therefore, all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.