

Case Number:	CM15-0083235		
Date Assigned:	05/05/2015	Date of Injury:	05/19/2009
Decision Date:	06/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/30/2015

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: Maryland, Texas, Virginia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine, Allergy and Immunology, Rheumatology

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 56-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/19/2009. Diagnoses include chronic low back pain, bilateral sciatic pain, lumbar degenerative disc disease, likely sacroiliac joint syndrome and pain related insomnia. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, medications, radiofrequency ablation (5/07/2013 and 6/10/2014) and elastic lumbar support. Per the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 3/09/2015, the injured worker reported chronic low back pain with radicular symptoms to the bilateral lower extremities. His pain is rated as 6/10 without medications and 3-4/10 with the use of medication. Physical examination revealed slight tenderness at the bilateral lumbar paraspinal region with some slight lower lumbar tenderness. The plan of care included medications and authorization was requested for Celebrex, Tramadol and Lyrica.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Celebrex 200mg # 30 with 2 Refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-inflammatory medications, Celebrex, NSAIDs Page(s): 22, 30, 70. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatory medications are the traditional first line treatment for pain, but COX-2 inhibitors (Celebrex) should be considered if the patient has risk of GI complications, according to MTUS. The medical documentation provided does not indicate a reason for the patient to be considered high risk for GI complications. Risk factors for GI bleeding according to ODG include: (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 or multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). The medical records do not indicate that he is undergoing treatment for any of the FDA approved uses such as osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile rheumatoid arthritis in patients 2 years and older, ankylosing spondylitis, acute pain, and primary dysmenorrhea. As such, the request for Celebrex 200mg #30 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.

Lyrica 75mg # 60 with 2 Refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs), Pregablin (Lyrica) Page(s): 16-17, 99. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for pain.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG state, "Pregabalin (Lyrica) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. Pregabalin was also approved to treat fibromyalgia. See Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for general guidelines, as well as specific Pregabalin listing for more information and references." MTUS additionally comments "Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) are also referred to as anti-convulsants. Recommended for neuropathic pain (pain due to nerve damage). A "good" response to the use of AEDs has been defined as a 50% reduction in pain and a "moderate" response as a 30% reduction. It has been reported that a 30% reduction in pain is clinically important to patients and a lack of response of this magnitude may be the "trigger" for the following: (1) a switch to a different first-line agent (TCA, SNRI or AED are considered first-line treatment); or (2) combination therapy if treatment with a single drug agent fails. (Eisenberg, 2007) (Jensen, 2006) 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 patient appears to have established neuropathic pain for which Lyrica is an appropriate medication. The medical records provided detail a 30% improvement in pain. There is no documentation of functional improvement on this medication. The UR modified the request to allow for 1 month with no refills, which is appropriate. As such, the request for Lyrica 75mg #60 with 2 refills is not medically necessary.

Tramadol 50mg # 60 with 2 Refills: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, Tramadol, Ultram Page(s): 74-96, 113, 123. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic) - Medications for acute pain (analgesics), Tramadol (Ultram).

Decision rationale: Tramadol is classified as central acting synthetic opioids. MTUS states regarding tramadol: "A therapeutic trial of opioids should not be employed until the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics. Before initiating therapy, the patient should set goals, and the continued use of opioids should be contingent on meeting these goals." ODG further states, "Tramadol is not recommended as a first-line oral analgesic because of its inferior efficacy to a combination of Hydrocodone/ acetaminophen." The treating physician did not provide sufficient documentation that the patient has failed a trial of non-opioid analgesics at the time of prescription or in subsequent medical notes. Additionally, no documentation was provided which discussed the setting of goals for the use of tramadol prior to the initiation of this medication. MTUS states: "ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life." The treating physician does not fully document the least reported pain over the period since last assessment, pain relief, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. The UR modified the request with no refills to facilitate a wean which is appropriate. As such, the request for Tramadol 50mg with 2 refills is not medically necessary.