

Case Number:	CM14-0211928		
Date Assigned:	01/02/2015	Date of Injury:	06/01/2007
Decision Date:	02/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/13/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/17/2014

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. 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, Texas, Florida

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management, Hospice & Palliative 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:

This is a 61 year old Male who had industrial injury on 6/1/07 related to pushing on a windshield. He had obtained xrays, MRI scans, EMG studies, physical therapy, surgeries, and medications. Last examination available for review is on 10/24/14, he has a physician state the injured worker complains of pain. Objective findings show the injured worker is status post surgery with positive straight leg raise and range of motion of the spine limited. There is also impingement signs in the shoulder and tenderness in the lumbar spine. A treatment plan is to refill medication, encourage the injured worker to do daily stretches, consult pain management, and get an EMG of the lower extremities. Injured worker is to return to clinic in 2 months. On 11/13/14 a non certification was made for the Gabapentin, Norco, Prilosec, and Flexeril. The rationale for the denial was due to not following guidelines for each of the medicines. A lack of documentation of functional improvement for the Gabapentin and Norco. A lack of a diagnosis to support the use of Prilosec. Flexeril was denied due to guidelines not recommending the addition of that medication to injured workers already taking other agents. Weaning was allowed for the discontinuation of the Flexeril and the Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Gabapentin 300mg #180: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 16-21 of 127.

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. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.

Norco 10/325mg #90 with 1 refill: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Norco is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68-69 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Omeprazole (Prilosec), 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. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Omeprazole (Prilosec) is not medically necessary.

Flexeril 10mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that Cyclobenzaprine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the Cyclobenzaprine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) is not medically necessary.