

Case Number:	CM14-0216102		
Date Assigned:	01/06/2015	Date of Injury:	04/01/2009
Decision Date:	02/24/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/03/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/23/2014

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 49 year old male who was sitting at a desk on a dock when a forklift struck the front of the desk throwing the worker and the chair about three feet. The date of injury was April 1, 2009. Diagnoses include rheumatoid arthritis, myalgia/myositis not otherwise specified and post laminectomy syndrome of the lumbar. On September 18, 2014, the injured worker complained of pain all throughout his body. He required a walker to stand up straight and a wheelchair to go anywhere. He had a right antalgic gait pointing to pain and swelling in the right knee. Physical examination revealed nine positive tender points. Normal range of motion was noted with both the upper and lower extremities. An electrodiagnostic study revealed normal findings. Medications were listed as treatment. A request was made for Gabapentin powder 550mg/Pyridoxine HCL crystals 100mg compound oral medication for the bilateral ankles, bilateral knees, left leg and lumbar spine. On December 3, 2014, utilization review denied the request.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Gabapentin powder 550mg/Pyridoxine HCL crystals 100mg Compound DOS 10/13/2014:
 Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines gabapentin Page(s): 18.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Gabapentin states: Gabapentin (Neurontin, Gabarone? generic available) 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. (Backonja, 2002) (ICSI, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Eisenberg, 2007) (Attal, 2006) This RCT concluded that gabapentin monotherapy appears to be efficacious for the treatment of pain and sleep interference associated with diabetic peripheral neuropathy and exhibits positive effects on mood and quality of life. (Backonja, 1998) It has been given FDA approval for treatment of post-herpetic neuralgia. The number needed to treat (NNT) for overall neuropathic pain is 4. It has a more favorable side-effect profile than Carbamazepine, with a number needed to harm of 2.5. (Wiffen2-Cochrane, 2005) (Zaremba, 2006) Gabapentin in combination with morphine has been studied for treatment of diabetic neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia. When used in combination the maximum tolerated dosage of both drugs was lower than when each was used as a single agent and better analgesia occurred at lower doses of each. (Gilron-NEJM, 2005) Recommendations involving combination therapy require further study. Mechanism of action: This medication appears to be effective in reducing abnormal hypersensitivity (allodynia and hyperalgesia), to have anti-anxiety effects, and may be beneficial as a sleep aid. (Arnold, 2007) Specific pain states: There is limited evidence to show that this medication is effective for postoperative pain, where there is fairly good evidence that the use of gabapentin and gabapentin-like compounds results in decreased opioid consumption. This beneficial effect, which may be related to an anti-anxiety effect, is accompanied by increased sedation and dizziness. (Peng, 2007) (Buvanendran, 2007) (Menigaux, 2005) (Pandey, 2005) The requested medication is a first line choice in the treatment of neuropathic pain per the California MTUS. The patient does not have any diagnoses of neuropathic pain. The physical exam is not suggestive of neuropathic pain. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.