

Case Number:	CM15-0219411		
Date Assigned:	11/12/2015	Date of Injury:	06/29/2012
Decision Date:	12/29/2015	UR Denial Date:	10/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/09/2015

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, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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:

The injured worker is a 34 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 6-29-2012. Diagnoses include cervical spine sprain-strain, lumbar sprain-strain, facet hypertrophy, status post right foot crush injury, status post right foot surgery. Treatments to date include activity modification, foot orthotic, therapeutic foot injection, and medication therapy. On 10-6-15, he complained of increasing pain in the low back associated with numbness, tingling in both feet, and pain in both wrists, right ankle and foot, and ongoing neck pain associated with headaches and radiation into bilateral upper extremities. Current medications prescribed since at least 5-19-15 included Naproxen, Tramadol, Gabapentin, Pantoprazole, and Hydrocodone 7.5mg-325mg was increased to Norco 10-325mg on that date. The physical examination documented decreased range of motion in cervical and lumbar spine, and decreased strength in the right ankle. The plan of care included ongoing medication management and weight loss. The appeal requested authorization for prescriptions of Norco 10-325mg #120, Neurontin 300mg #120, and Motrin 800mg #60. The Utilization Review dated 10-22-15, denied the request, however, due to the recommendation of weaning, a one month supply was allow for Norco and Neurontin.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 10/325 mg Qty 120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids (Classification), Opioids, criteria for use, Opioids for chronic pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids 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 non-adherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the 4 A's (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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. Review of the available medical records reveals no documentation to support the medical necessity of Norco or any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Specifically, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, appropriate medication use, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Furthermore, efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity. There is no documentation comprehensively addressing this concern in the records available for my review. As MTUS recommends discontinuing opioids if there is no overall improvement in function, is not medically necessary.

Neurontin 300 mg Qty 120: Upheld

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: With regard to antiepilepsy drugs, the MTUS CPMTG states "Fibromyalgia: Gabapentin and pregabalin have been found to be safe and efficacious to treat pain and other symptoms. (Arnold, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) Pregabalin is FDA approved for fibromyalgia." Per MTUS CPMTG, "Gabapentin (Neurontin) 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." With regard to medication history, the medical records submitted for review indicate that the injured worker has been using this medication since at least 5/2015. Per MTUS CPMTG p17, "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." The documentation submitted for review did not contain evidence of improvement in function. As such, is not medically necessary.

Motrin 800 mg Qty 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: With regard to the use of NSAIDs for chronic low back pain, the MTUS CPMTG states "Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another." "Low back pain (chronic): Both acetaminophen and NSAIDs have been recommended as first line therapy for low back pain. There is insufficient evidence to recommend one medication over the other. Selection should be made on a case-by-case basis based on weighing efficacy vs. side effect profile." The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker has been using this medication since at least 5/2015. As it is only recommended for short-term symptomatic relief, the request is not medically necessary.