MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0029581		
Date Assigned:	02/23/2015	Date of Injury:	08/13/2001
Decision Date:	04/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/18/2015

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: Indiana
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

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 67 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/13/2001. On 2/18/15, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of Percocet 10/325mg #120, and Gralise 600mg #60, and Lansoprazole 30mg #30. The treating provider has reported the injured worker complained of neck and bilateral upper extremity pain and indicating medication allow her to perform activities of daily living. Injured worker is considering a spinal cord stimulator. The diagnoses have included cervical radiculopathy, cervical post laminectomy syndrome, neuropathy nerve entrapment, anxiety and osteopenia. Treatment to date has included status post C4 through C7 anterior discectomy and fusion (2004; status post C5-C6 bilateral neuroforaminotomy, C6 laminectomy and posterior C5-through C7 fusion, post operative complications by MRSA, septic shock, acute respiratory failure, incision and drainage (2011). On 2/2/15 Utilization Review non-certified Percocet 10/325mg #120, and Gralise 600mg #60, and Lansoprazole 30mg #30. The MTUS and ACOEM Guidelines were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Percocet 10/325mg #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 74-96. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic), Opioids.

Decision rationale: Percocet (oxycodone with acetaminophen) is a short-acting opioid. Chronic pain guidelines and ODG do not recommend opioid, except for short use for severe cases, not to exceed 2 weeks." In addition, routine long-term opioid therapy is not recommended (and ODG recommends consideration of a one-month limit on opioids) for new chronic non-malignant pain patients in most cases, as there is little research to support use. The research available does not support overall general effectiveness and indicates numerous adverse effects with long-term use. The latter includes the risk of ongoing psychological dependence with difficultly weaning. Medical documents indicate that the patient has been on Percocet for several months, in excess of the recommended 2-week limit. Additionally, indications for when opioids should be discontinued include, "If there is no overall improvement in function, unless there are extenuating circumstances." The treating physician does document some pain level improvement, however, does not document overall improvement in function, which is required for continued use of this medication. As such, the request for Percocet is not medically necessary.

Gralise 600mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Gralise; Antiepilepsy Drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-Epilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-22. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for pain, Gabapentin (Neurontin®).

Decision rationale: The MTUS considers Gralise (gabapentin) as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain and effective for the treatment of spinal cord injury, lumbar spinal stenosis, and post op pain. MTUS also recommends a trial of Gabapentin for complex regional pain syndrome. ODG states, "Recommended Trial Period: One recommendation for an adequate trial with Gabapentin is three to eight weeks for titration, then one to two weeks at maximum tolerated dosage (Dworkin, 2003). The patient should be asked at each visit as to whether there has been a change in pain or function. Current consensus based treatment algorithms for diabetic neuropathy suggests that if inadequate control of pain is found, a switch to another first-line drug is recommended." Additionally, ODG states that Gabapentin, "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." Based on the clinical documentation provided, there is no evidence of neuropathic type pain or radicular pain on exam or subjectively. As such, without any evidence of neuropathic type pain, the medication is not medically necessary.

Lansoprazole 30mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs; GI risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: MTUS states "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)," and "Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease : (1) A non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg omeprazole daily) or misoprostol (200 g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44)." ODG states, "If a PPI is used, omeprazole OTC tablets or lansoprazole 24HR OTC are recommended for an equivalent clinical efficacy and significant cost savings. Products in this drug class have demonstrated equivalent clinical efficacy and safety at comparable doses, including esomeprazole (Nexium), lansoprazole (Prevacid), omeprazole (Prilosec), pantoprazole (Protonix), dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and rabeprazole (Aciphex) (Shi, 2008). A trial of omeprazole or lansoprazole is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)" The medical documents provided do not establish the patient has having documented GI bleeding/perforation/peptic ulcer or other GI risk factors as outlined in MTUS. Additionally, there is no evidence provided to indicate the patient suffers from dyspepsia because of the present medication regimen. As such, the request for Lansoprazole is not medically necessary.