

Case Number:	CM15-0086558		
Date Assigned:	05/08/2015	Date of Injury:	10/23/2001
Decision Date:	06/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/05/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 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 57 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10/23/01. The injured worker has complaints of neck, back and lower extremity pain. The injured worker reports that she reports approximately 3 hours of sleep nightly. The diagnoses have included reflex sympathetic dystrophy of the lower limb; psychogenic pain and long-term medications use. Treatment to date has included gabapentin; Protonix and nabumetone-relafen. The request was for nabumetone-relafen 500mg one twice daily #90; pantoprazole-protonix 20mg #60 (ms), 1 tablet twice a day #60 and gabapentin 600mg (ms), 2 in the morning, 2 in the afternoon and 2 in the evening #180.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Nabumetone-Relafen 500mg one twice daily #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs
Page(s): 67-69.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Relafen (nabumetone), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that Relafen is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale), or any objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Relafen is not medically necessary.

Pantoprazole-Protonix 20mg #60 (ms), 1 tablet twice a day #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Proton Pump Inhibitor Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for pantoprazole (Protonix), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Additionally, ODG recommends Nexium, Protonix, Dexilant, and AcipHex for use as 2nd line agents, after failure of omeprazole or lansoprazole. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use. Furthermore, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line agents prior to initiating treatment with pantoprazole (a 2nd line proton pump inhibitor). In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested pantoprazole is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 600mg (ms), 2 in the morning, 2 in the afternoon and 2 in the evening #180: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-21.

Decision rationale: Regarding request for gabapentin (Neurontin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that antiepilepsy drugs are recommended for neuropathic pain. They go on to state that a good outcome is defined as 50% reduction in pain and a moderate response is defined as 30% reduction in pain. Guidelines go on to state that 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. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of any specific analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS), and no documentation of specific objective functional improvement. Additionally, there is no discussion regarding side effects from this medication.

Lastly, a previous utilization review on 9/25/2014 has recommended the patient to be weaning off this medication. As such, the currently requested gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.