

Case Number:	CM15-0188001		
Date Assigned:	09/29/2015	Date of Injury:	01/17/2014
Decision Date:	11/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/24/2015

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 January 17, 2014. A recent secondary treating office visit dated July 23, 2015 reported subjective complaint of "he is getting better, trying to think less about pain." Physical examination noted "unchanged." The following diagnoses were applied to the visit: chronic pain syndrome, and left hand pain. The plan of care noted renewing medications: Gabapentin and Omeprazole. Primary treating office visit dated July 08, 2015 reported "no new complaints and left hand pain." There is note of "physical therapy helping him manage pain." Primary treating visit dated May 27, 2015 reported "no new complaints, left hand pain that is intermittent, and therapy helps the hand." Secondary treating visit dated May 28, 2015 reported medications consisted of: Gabapentin 300mg, Omeprazole. On August 03, 2015 a request was made for Gabapentin powder 3GM, Capsaicin 0.0075GM, and Amitriptyline 1.5GM which was noncertified by Utilization review on August 27, 2015.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Amitriptyline 1.5 grams #1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Anti-depressants for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on the requested medication states: Tricyclic anti-depressants are recommended over selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), unless adverse reactions are a problem. Caution is required because tricyclics have a low threshold for toxicity, and tricyclic anti-depressant overdose is a significant cause of fatal drug poisoning due to their cardiovascular and neurological effects. Tricyclic anti-depressants have been shown in both a meta-analysis (McQuay, 1996) and a systematic review (Collins, 2000) to be effective, and are considered a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain. (Namaka, 2004) (Dworkin, 2003) (Gilron, 2006) (Wolfe, 2004) (Dworkin, 2007) (Saarto-Cochrane, 2007) This class of medications works in both patients with normal mood and patients with depressed mood when used in treatment for neuropathic pain. (Sindrup, 2005) Indications in controlled trials have shown effectiveness in treating central post-stroke pain, post-herpetic neuralgia (Argoff, 2004), painful diabetic and non-diabetic polyneuropathy, and post-mastectomy pain. Negative results were found for spinal cord pain and phantom-limb pain, but this may have been due to study design. (Finnerup, 2005) Tricyclics have not demonstrated significance in randomized-control trials in treating HIV neuropathy, spinal cord injury, cisplatin neuropathy, neuropathic cancer pain, phantom limb pain or chronic lumbar root pain. (Dworkin, 2007) One review reported the NNT for at least moderate neuropathic pain relief with tricyclics is 3.6 (3-4.5), with the NNT for Amitriptyline being 3.1 (2.5-4.2). The NNT for venlafaxine, calculated using 3 studies, was reported to be 3.1 (2.2-5.1). (Saarto-Cochrane, 2007) Another review reported that the NNT for 50% improvement in neuropathic pain was 2 to 3 for tricyclic anti-depressants, 4 for venlafaxine, and 7 for SSRIs (Perrot, 2008). The patient does not have a diagnosis of neuropathic pain but rather chronic pain syndrome and hand pain. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for Capsaicin 0.0075 gram #1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Capsaicin, topical.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS section on the requested medication states: Recommended only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. Formulations: Capsaicin is generally available as a 0.025% formulation (as a treatment for osteoarthritis) and a 0.075% formulation (primarily studied for post-herpetic neuralgia, diabetic neuropathy and post-mastectomy pain). There have been no studies of a 0.0375% formulation of capsaicin and there is no current indication that this increase over a 0.025% formulation would provide any further efficacy. Indications: There are positive randomized studies with capsaicin cream in patients with osteoarthritis, fibromyalgia, and chronic non-specific back pain, but it should be considered experimental in very high doses. Although topical capsaicin has moderate to poor efficacy, it may be particularly useful (alone or in conjunction with other modalities) in patients whose pain has not been controlled successfully with conventional therapy. The number needed to treat in musculoskeletal conditions was 8.1. The patient has chronic pain syndrome and hand pain but not documented intolerance to other first line treatment options. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

Retrospective request for Gabapentin powder 3 gram #1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Neurontin states: Gabapentin (Neurontin, Gabarone, generic available) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain. (Backonja, 2002) (ICSI, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Eisenberg, 2007) (Attal, 2006) This RCT concluded that gabapentin monotherapy appears to be efficacious for the treatment of pain and sleep interference associated with diabetic peripheral neuropathy and exhibits positive effects on mood and quality of life. (Backonja, 1998) It has been given FDA approval for treatment of post-herpetic neuralgia. The number needed to treat (NNT) for overall neuropathic pain is 4. It has a more favorable side-effect profile than Carbamazepine, with a number needed to harm of 2.5. (Wiffen2-Cochrane, 2005) (Zaremba, 2006) Gabapentin in combination with morphine has been studied for treatment of diabetic neuropathy and post-herpetic neuralgia. When used in combination the maximum tolerated dosage of both drugs was lower than when each was used as a single agent and better analgesia occurred at lower doses of each. (Gilron-NEJM, 2005) Recommendations involving combination therapy require further study. The patient has the diagnosis of chronic pain syndrome and hand pain and not a primary neuropathic pain diagnosis. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.