

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0076166		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/27/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/22/2004
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/25/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/03/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/21/2015

### 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 60 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 10/22/04. She has reported initial complaints of neck and back injuries after tripping and falling over a mat. The diagnoses have included cervical and lumbar degenerative disc disease (DDD) with radiculopathy and cervical and lumbar stenosis. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, medications, chiropractic 24 sessions, home exercise program (HEP) and corset. Currently, as per the physician progress note dated 2/27/15, the injured worker complains of intermittent aching neck pain that radiates to the right side head and causes intense headaches. She rates the pain 5/10 on pain scale for the upper extremities which is slightly less than previous visit which was rated 6/10. The neck pain was rated 8/10 with cramping in the upper back. She has constant low back aching pain and bilateral lower extremity pain with numbness that radiates to the groin and feet. She notes cramping with pins and needles in the knees and cramping in the left thigh. The objective findings revealed tenderness in the cervical and lumbar spine and decreased sensation. The physician noted that she is to continue medications, home exercise program (HEP) and chiropractic care. The physician requested treatments included Tylenol 3, no dosage/quantity indicated, Relafen, no dosage/quantity indicated, Gabapentin 600mg, no quantity indicated and Prilosec 20mg, no quantity indicated.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Tylenol 3, no dosage/quantity indicated:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids for chronic pain Page(s): 80.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Tylenol #3, 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) 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 Tylenol #3 is not medically necessary.

**Relafen, no dosage/quantity indicated:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 67-73.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 67-72 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Relafen, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that NSAIDs are recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that Relafen is providing any specific analgesic benefits (in terms of percent pain reduction, or reduction in numeric rating scale) or any objective functional improvement. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Relafen is not medically necessary.

**Gabapentin 600mg, no quantity indicated:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs) Page(s): 16-22.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 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 specific objective functional improvement. 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.

**Prilosec 20mg, no quantity indicated:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) 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.