

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0107203		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/11/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/26/2000
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/13/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/28/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/03/2015

### 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:

This 36 year old female sustained an industrial injury to the low back on 12/26/00. Previous treatment included lumbar fusion times two, left L4-5 nerve root block injections and medications. In a PR-2 dated 3/30/15, the injured worker complained of low back pain with radiation to bilateral lower extremities. The injured worker was pending spinal cord stimulator trial. Physical exam was remarkable for tenderness to palpation to the lumbar paraspinal musculature, posterior superior iliac spine and lumbar facets, 5/5 lower extremity motor strength, positive left straight leg raise, positive facet loading sign, decreased lumbar range of motion and decreased bilateral lower extremity sensation to light touch. Current diagnoses included lumbar spine radiculitis, lumbar facet arthropathy, lumbar spine degenerative disc disease, lumbar myofascial pain syndrome and failed back surgery syndrome. The injured worker was given a trial of Gralise on 1/5/15. The treatment plan included a referral to a pain management specialist for spinal cord stimulator trial, refilling Butrans and prescriptions for Celebrex and Gralise.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Celebrex 200mg #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68, 70.

**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): 22 and 30 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for celecoxib (Celebrex), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Celebrex may be considered if the patient has a risk of GI complications. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a high risk of GI complications. There is no indication that Celebrex is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale), or any objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested celecoxib (Celebrex) is not medically necessary.

**Gralise 600mg #90:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) Page(s): 16-19.

**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): 16-21 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding request for Gralise, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that anti-epilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that after initiation of treatment, there should be documentation of pain relief and improvement in function as well as documentation of side effects incurred with use. The continued use of AEDs depends on improved outcomes versus tolerability of adverse effects. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Antiepileptic drugs should not be abruptly discontinued but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request. As such, the currently requested Gralise is not medically necessary.

**Butrans 10mcg #4:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Buprenorphine Page(s): 26-27.

**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 Butrans (buprenorphine), 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), 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 Butrans (buprenorphine) is not medically necessary.