

Case Number:	CM15-0079134		
Date Assigned:	06/01/2015	Date of Injury:	01/10/2002
Decision Date:	06/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/24/2015

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 a 59-year-old, male who sustained a work related injury on 1/10/02. A crate was not passed up hard enough and he had to bend over to catch it, but as he bent over both feet slipped right underneath him forward, causing him to fall backwards landing on a 4" x 4" piece of wood. He had immediate stabbing pain in his low back. The diagnoses have included cervical radiculitis to right arm, lumbar discogenic disease, lumbar radiculopathy, left knee internal derangement, left knee meniscal tear, probable right wrist carpal tunnel syndrome and lung cancer. Treatments have included oral medications, pain creams, trigger point injections, chiropractic treatments, heat therapy, lumbar epidural steroid injections, TENS unit therapy, use of a left knee brace, lumbar spine surgery and chemotherapy for his lung cancer. In the PR-2 dated 2/5/15, the injured worker complains of neck, right shoulder, low back, left knee and right wrist pain. He rates all his pain levels an 8/10. He has decreased range of motion in right shoulder. He has spasm, painful and decreased range of motion in cervical spine. He has cervical facet tenderness. He has tenderness to left knee joint line. He has a positive McMurray test. He has pain with range of motion in knee. He has left knee swelling. He has spasm in lumbar spine. He has painful and limited range of motion in lumbar spine. He has positive straight leg raise bilaterally at 50 degrees. He has tenderness to palpation over the lumbar paraspinal musculature. The treatment plan includes continuation of use of left knee brace, continue with medications, finish chemotherapy and return to clinic in eight weeks.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Neurontin 600mg Qty 60: Overturned

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

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

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Neurontin states: Gabapentin (Neurontin, Gabarone, generic available) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and post herpetic 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 post herpetic 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. The requested medication is a first line agent to treatment neuropathic pain. The patient does have a diagnosis of neuropathic pain in the form of radiculopathy. Therefore, the request is medically necessary.

Klonopin 1mg # 60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines benzodiazepines Page(s): 22.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on benzodiazepines states: Benzodiazepines; Not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic, anxiolytic, anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant. Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. Tolerance to hypnotic effects develops rapidly. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Tolerance to anticonvulsant and muscle relaxant effects occurs within weeks. (Baillargeon, 2003) (Ashton, 2005). The chronic long-term use of this class of medication is recommended in very few conditions per the California MTUS. There is no evidence however

of failure of first line agent for the treatment of anxiety in the provided documentation. For this reason, the request is not medically necessary.

1 Lumbar Epidural Steroid Injection: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines epidural steroid injections Page(s): 46.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on epidural steroid injections (ESI) states: Criteria for the use of Epidural steroid injections: Note: The purpose of ESI is to reduce pain and inflammation, restoring range of motion and thereby facilitating progress in more active treatment programs, and avoiding surgery, but this treatment alone offers no significant long-term functional benefit. 1) Radiculopathy must be documented by physical examination and corroborated by imaging studies and/or electrodiagnostic testing. 2) Initially unresponsive to conservative treatment (exercises, physical methods, NSAIDs and muscle relaxants). 3) Injections should be performed using fluoroscopy (live x-ray) for guidance. 4) If used for diagnostic purposes, a maximum of two injections should be performed. A second block is not recommended if there is inadequate response to the first block. Diagnostic blocks should be at an interval of at least one to two weeks between injections. 5) No more than two nerve root levels should be injected using transforaminal blocks. 6) No more than one interlaminar level should be injected at one session. 7) In the therapeutic phase, repeat blocks should be based on continued objective documented pain and functional improvement, including at least 50% pain relief with associated reduction of medication use for six to eight weeks, with a general recommendation of no more than 4 blocks per region per year. (Manchikanti, 2003) (CMS, 2004) (Boswell, 2007) 8) Current research does not support a "series-of-three" injections in either the diagnostic or therapeutic phase. We recommend no more than 2 ESI injections. The provided clinical documentation for review does not show dermatomal radiculopathy on exam that is corroborated by imaging or EMG studies, as level is not defined. Therefore, the request does not meet all criteria as outlined above and is not medically necessary.