

Case Number:	CM13-0054946		
Date Assigned:	12/30/2013	Date of Injury:	03/03/2010
Decision Date:	04/29/2014	UR Denial Date:	11/01/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/20/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Acupuncture and Pain Medicine, and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

49y/o male injured worker with date of injury 3/3/10 with related left side lower back pain radiating to left buttock, hip, thigh, leg, lateral ankle; and numbness/tingling in foot. He is diagnosed with hip and thigh injury NOS. 9/30/11 MRI of the hip showed 1.5cm labral tear and mild gluteal tendinosis and greater trochanteric bursitis. MRI of the lumbar spine dated 9/30/11 was normal. He was refractory to physical therapy and medication management. The date of UR decision was 11/1/13.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

CARISOPRODOL 350MG #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol (Soma) Page(s): 29.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol Page(s): 29.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS CPMTG p29, "Not recommended. This medication is not indicated for long-term use. Carisoprodol is a commonly prescribed, centrally acting skeletal muscle relaxant whose primary active metabolite is meprobamate (a schedule-IV controlled substance). Carisoprodol is now scheduled in several states but not on a federal level. It has been

suggested that the main effect is due to generalized sedation and treatment of anxiety. Abuse has been noted for sedative and relaxant effects. In regular abusers the main concern is the accumulation of meprobamate. Carisoprodol abuse has also been noted in order to augment or alter effects of other drugs." As this medication is not recommended by MTUS, it is found not medically necessary. The records submitted for review indicate that the injured worker has been using this medication since 2/2013; it is not indicated for long-term use.

HYDROCODONE BIT/ACETAMINOPHEN 10/325MG #180: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 91.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding on-going management of opioids "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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4 A's' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveal no documentation to support the medical necessity of Hydrocodone BIT/Acetaminophen nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Additionally, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity and have been noted in the documentation. The injured worker admits tobacco and illicit drug use. Urinalysis has been consistent with prescribed medications. However, there is no documentation comprehensively addressing pain relief and functional improvement in the records available for my review. The request is not medically necessary.

KADIAN: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 78, 93.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines p78 regarding ongoing management of opioids "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 nonadherent) drug related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the '4 A's' (Analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and any 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." Review of the available medical records reveal neither documentation to support the medical necessity of Kadian nor any documentation addressing the '4 A's' domains, which is a recommended practice for the on-going management of opioids. Additionally, the notes do not appropriately review and document pain relief, functional status improvement, or side effects. The MTUS considers this list of criteria for initiation and continuation of opioids in the context of efficacy required to substantiate medical necessity, and they do not appear to have been addressed by the treating physician in the documentation available for review. Efforts to rule out aberrant behavior (e.g. CURES report, UDS, opiate agreement) are necessary to assure safe usage and establish medical necessity and have been noted in the documentation. The injured worker admits tobacco and illicit drug use. Urinalysis has been consistent with prescribed medications. However, there is no documentation comprehensively addressing pain relief and functional improvement in the records available for my review. The request is not medically necessary.

LUNESTA 2MG #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), Insomnia Treatment

Decision rationale: With regard to insomnia treatment, the ODG guidelines state "Non-Benzodiazepine sedative-hypnotics (Benzodiazepine-receptor agonists): First-line medications for insomnia. This class of medications includes zolpidem (Ambien® and Ambien® CR), zaleplon (Sonata®), and eszopicolone (Lunesta®). Benzodiazepine-receptor agonists work by selectively binding to type-1 benzodiazepine receptors in the CNS. All of the benzodiazepine-receptor agonists are schedule IV controlled substances, which mean they have potential for abuse and dependency. Although direct comparisons between benzodiazepines and the non-benzodiazepine hypnotics have not been studied, it appears that the non-benzodiazepines have similar efficacy to the benzodiazepines with fewer side effects and short duration of action." The documentation submitted for review indicate that the injured worker began using this medication 2/19/13. There is no evidence of a sleep disturbance which necessitates this medication. Failure of sleep disturbance to resolve in a 7 to 10 day period may indicate a psychiatric and/or medical illness. The request is not medically necessary.