

Case Number:	CM15-0122561		
Date Assigned:	07/02/2015	Date of Injury:	01/20/2003
Decision Date:	08/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/12/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/23/2015

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 50-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 1/20/2003 resulting in headaches, neck, left shoulder, arm, and elbow pain and numbness. The injured worker was diagnosed with cervical disc herniation with intermittent radiculopathy at C6-C7, right carpal tunnel syndrome, shoulder pain with possible impingement and bilateral upper extremity overuse tendinopathy. Documented treatment has included C6-7 anterior cervical discectomy and fusion, cubital tunnel and lateral epicondylar release, left shoulder arthroscopy, home exercise program, and medication which is reported to provide temporary pain relief, enabling him to perform activities of daily living. The injured worker continues to report chronic pain. The treating physician's plan of care includes Ultram 50 mg and Gabapentin 300/600mg. He is presently not working.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

60 Ultram 50mg with 1 refill: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines On-going management of Opioids.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultram, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this 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. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Ultram is not medically necessary.

90 Gabapentin 300/600mg with 2 refills: 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 8 C.C.R. MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) 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. Antiepileptic drugs should not be abruptly discontinued but unfortunately there is no provision to modify the current request. As such, the currently requested gabapentin (Neurontin) is not medically necessary.

60 Prilosec 20mg with 2 refills: 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 8 C.C.R. MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page 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.