

Case Number:	CM14-0178733		
Date Assigned:	11/03/2014	Date of Injury:	05/17/2007
Decision Date:	12/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/09/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/28/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture & Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 35 year old female injured worker with date of injury 5/17/07 with related neck, low back, and left knee pain. Per progress report dated 8/15/14, the injured worker presented with pain, tenderness, discomfort, limited range of motion, difficulty with physical activity with associated pain. She also complained of aching pain in her left wrist. Per physical exam, there was tenderness in the paraspinal musculature of the cervical region and the anterior neck. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medication management.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Celebrex 200mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 70.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS CPMTG p70, Celebrex is used for the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, and ankylosing spondylitis. It works as an anti-inflammatory, analgesic, and antipyretic. It does not have an anti-platelet effect and is not a substitute for aspirin for cardiac prophylaxis. The documentation submitted for review contains

no evidence that the injured worker was refractory to treatment with ibuprofen or naproxen. The MTUS supports the use of Cox-2 inhibitors for individuals with an increased risk or history of Gastrointestinal (GI) complications. The documentation did not note any history of GI complications, or risk factors for GI complications. While it is noted that NSAIDs are clinically indicated for this claimant, the requested Celebrex is not supported by the guidelines. This request is considered not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 300/600mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-18.

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 Chronic Pain Medical Guidelines, "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." 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 pain relief and improvement in function with the use of this medication. As such, the request is not medically necessary.