MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0190553		
Date Assigned:	10/30/2015	Date of Injury:	05/21/2009
Decision Date:	12/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/28/2015

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 is a 46 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 5-21-2009. Diagnoses include failed back syndrome, lumbar radiculopathy, chronic pain, status post multiple lumbar fusions. Treatments to date include activity modification, medication therapy, and physical therapy, epidural steroid injections, and lumbar radiofrequency. It was noted on 12-18-15, there was a successful neurostimulator trial with 75% improvement in pain relief and functional ability, and she was pending permanent placement. On 9-1-15, she complained of no improvement in pain in the low back. There were no associated symptoms documented. Current medications and efficacy of medications were not documented. The physical examination documented lumbar tenderness with muscle spasms present. There was decreased sensation in bilateral feet, decreased lumbar range of motion, and positive straight leg raise tests bilaterally. The plan of care included follow up with pain management. This review will address the request to authorize Neurontin 300mg #90. The Utilization Review dated 9-3-15, denied the request.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Neurontin 300mg #90: Overturned

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Antiepilepsy 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 fortreatment 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 postherpetic 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 neuropathic pain in the form of lumbar radiculopathy. Therefore the request is medically necessary.