

Case Number:	CM15-0103833		
Date Assigned:	06/03/2015	Date of Injury:	06/14/2009
Decision Date:	07/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/26/2015

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 75 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on June 14, 2009, incurring injuries after an altercation with a client while working as a nurse's aide. A cervical Magnetic Resonance Imaging was abnormal. She was diagnosed with multilevel discogenic disease with cervical spondylosis. Treatment included physical therapy, pain medications, anti-inflammatory drugs, muscle relaxants, proton pump inhibitor and antidepressants. Currently, the injured worker complained of neck pain radiating into the arm and reduced range of motion of both her neck and arm. She complained of persistent insomnia and depression secondary to her injuries. She was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included prescriptions for Fexmid, Ultram and Ambien.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Fexmid 7.5mg quantity 120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine Page(s): 41; 64.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for cyclobenzaprine (Fexmid), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of non-sedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that cyclobenzaprine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the cyclobenzaprine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested cyclobenzaprine (Fexmid) is not medically necessary.

Ultram 150mg quantity 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Tramadol Page(s): 78; 93-94; 113.

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ultram (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 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), no documentation regarding side effects, 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 Ultram (tramadol) is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg quantity 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Zolpidem.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES (ODG) Chronic Pain, Sleep Medication, Insomnia treatment cool.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for zolpidem (Ambien), California MTUS guidelines are silent regarding the use of sedative hypnotic agents. ODG recommends the short-term use (usually two to six weeks) of pharmacological agents only after careful evaluation of potential

causes of sleep disturbance. They go on to state the failure of sleep disturbances to resolve in 7 to 10 days, may indicate a psychiatric or medical illness. Within the documentation available for review, there is no current description of the patient's insomnia, no discussion regarding what behavioral treatments have been attempted, and no statement indicating how the patient has responded to Ambien treatment. Furthermore, there is no indication that Ambien is being used for short term use as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested zolpidem (Ambien) is not medically necessary.