

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0099613		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/29/2004
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/09/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/22/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/22/2015

### 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 57 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/29/2004. The current diagnoses are cervicalgia, post cervical laminectomy syndrome, and lumbago, post lumbar laminectomy syndrome. According to the progress report dated 4/8/2015, the injured worker complains of constant low back and neck pain. The pain is characterized as burning. The pain is rated 6/10 with medications and 8/10 without. The physical examination of the cervical and lumbar spine reveals tenderness to palpation over the paraspinal muscles and decreased range of motion with flexion and extension. The current medications are Cyclobenzaprine, Lidocaine, Lyrica, and Lorcet. Treatment to date has included medication management, x-rays, and surgical intervention. The plan of care includes prescriptions for Hydrocodone/APAP, Tramadol, and Gabapentin.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Hydrocodone/APAP 5/325mg #60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use for a therapeutic trial of opioids, Opioids for chronic pain.

**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 hydrocodone/APAP, 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 minimal pain relief noted (2 point on VAS) with use of opioids, but there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS) and no discussion regarding monitoring for appropriate medication usage/aberrant behaviors. 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 hydrocodone/APAP is not medically necessary.

**Tramadol 50mg #120:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use for a therapeutic trial of opioids, Opioids for chronic pain.

**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 tramadol, 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 minimal pain relief noted (2 point on VAS) with use of opioids, but there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS) and no discussion regarding monitoring for appropriate medication usage/aberrant behaviors. 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 tramadol is not medically necessary.

**Gabapentin 100mg #90:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-epilepsy drugs.

**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 significant analgesic benefit (in terms of percent reduction in pain or reduction of NRS) with regard to neuropathic pain, and no documentation of 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.