

Case Number:	CM15-0072679		
Date Assigned:	04/22/2015	Date of Injury:	10/24/2011
Decision Date:	05/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/16/2015

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

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 with an industrial injury dated 04/01/1989-11/22/10. His diagnoses include degeneration of lumbar or lumbosacral intervertebral disc, thoracic or lumbosacral neuritis or radiculitis, lumbar post laminectomy syndrome, cervical spine degeneration, and rotator cuff tendonitis. Prior treatment includes shoulder injections, TENS, home exercise program and medications. He presents on 03/05/2015 with complaints of neck, shoulder and low back pain. Physical exam of the lumbar spine revealed moderate tenderness with limited flexion and extension due to pain. There was diffuse tenderness to palpation at anterior shoulders bilaterally. Treatment plan included pain management with medications and home exercise program.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Naproxen 550mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), Page 22.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatory are the traditional first line of treatment, to reduce pain so activity and functional restoration can resume, but long-term use may not be warranted. Monitoring of NSAID's functional benefit is advised as per Guidelines, long-term use of NSAIDS beyond a few weeks may actually retard muscle and connective tissue healing and increase the risk of hip fractures. Available reports submitted have not adequately addressed the indication to continue a NSAID for a chronic injury nor have they demonstrated any functional efficacy derived from treatment already rendered. The Naproxen 550mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Tramadol ER 150mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

Decision rationale: Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Tramadol ER 150mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Lyrica 150mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Pregabalin (Lyrica), page 100.

Decision rationale: Pregabalin (Lyrica) has been documented to be effective in treatment of diabetic neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia, has FDA approval for both indications, and is considered first-line treatment for both. This anti-epileptic medication may be helpful in the treatment of radiculopathy and would be indicated if there is documented significant benefit. It appears the medication has been prescribed for quite some time; however, there is no documented functional improvement as the patient continues with constant severe significant pain level and remains functionally unchanged for this chronic injury. Submitted medical report has not adequately demonstrated indication and functional benefit to continue ongoing treatment with this anti-epileptic. The Lyrica 150mg #90 is not medically necessary and appropriate.