

Case Number:	CM15-0179792		
Date Assigned:	09/21/2015	Date of Injury:	06/05/2013
Decision Date:	10/26/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/11/2015

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: 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:

The injured worker is 41 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 6-5-13 due to repetitive positioning at work resulting in injury to the neck and bilateral shoulders. Diagnoses included cervical sprain; cervical degenerative disc disease. He currently (8-5-15) reports slow and gradual improvement in neck and right shoulder discomfort. On physical exam of the cervical spine there was tightness of the paravertebral and trapezius area, normal range of motion; bilateral shoulder exam was normal. In the 5-13-15 progress note he reported a pain level of 4 out of 10 but improving with massage therapy and physical exam was the same as the 8-5-15 exam. Diagnostics included computed tomography of the cervical spine (6-18-14) showing degenerative disc disease, intervertebral disc at C6-7 with congenital fusion. Treatments to date include myelography of the cervical spine (6-19-14) revealing block vertebrae at C6-7 and degenerative changes; acupuncture; medications which are helpful and include Motrin, Lyrica, and tramadol; massage therapy with benefit; physical therapy; chiropractic treatments; injections. In the progress note dated 8-5-15 the treating provider's plan of care included requests for Lyrica 25mg #60; tramadol 100mg #60 for inflammation. The request for authorization dated 8-5-15 indicated tramadol 50mg #30; Lyrica 25mg #60. On 8-17-15 utilization review evaluated and non-certified the requests for tramadol 50mg #30 based on no clear establishment of consistent, significant improvement in pain level or any measurable functional improvement or change in work status specifically attributable to previous use of opioids and there is an inconsistency noted between the request for authorization (50 mg #30) and the report (100mg#60); Lyrica 25mg #60 based on no subjective complaints or objective findings of neuropathic pain.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Tramadol 50mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on opioids states for ongoing management: On-Going Management. Actions Should Include: (a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain; the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. Information from family members or other caregivers should be considered in determining the patient's response to treatment. The 4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring: Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non-adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework for documentation of the clinical use of these controlled drugs. (Passik, 2000) (d) Home: To aid in pain and functioning assessment, the patient should be requested to keep a pain diary that includes entries such as pain triggers, and incidence of end-of-dose pain. It should be emphasized that using this diary will help in tailoring the opioid dose. This should not be a requirement for pain management. (e) Use of drug screening or inpatient treatment with issues of abuse, addiction, or poor pain control. (f) Documentation of misuse of medications (doctor- shopping, uncontrolled drug escalation, drug diversion). (g) Continuing review of overall situation with regard to non-opioid means of pain control. (h) Consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain does not improve on opioids in 3 months. Consider a psych consult if there is evidence of depression, anxiety or irritability. Consider an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse. When to Continue Opioids: (a) If the patient has returned to work; (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain. (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004) The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant improvement in VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measurements of improvement in function or activity specifically due to the medication. Therefore all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.

Lyrica 25mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs).

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Lyrica states: Pregabalin (Lyrica, no generic available) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and post herpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. This medication is designated as a Schedule V controlled substance because of its causal relationship with euphoria. (Blommel, 2007) This medication also has an anti-anxiety effect. Pregabalin is being considered by the FDA as treatment for generalized anxiety disorder and social anxiety disorder. In June 2007 the FDA announced the approval of pregabalin as the first approved treatment for fibromyalgia. (ICSI, 2007) (Tassone, 2007) (Knotkova, 2007) (Eisenberg, 2007) (Crofford, 2005) (Stacey, 2008) The patient does not have the diagnoses of diabetic neuropathy, fibromyalgia or post herpetic neuropathy. There is no documentation of failure of other first line agents for peripheral neuropathy. Therefore guideline recommendations have not been met and the request is not medically necessary.