

Case Number:	CM15-0143000		
Date Assigned:	08/03/2015	Date of Injury:	02/24/2004
Decision Date:	09/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/26/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/23/2015

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 43 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 2-24-04. Initial complaints were not reviewed. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical spine disc syndrome; status post sprain-strain disorder lumbar; lumbar spine radiculopathy; thoracic spine disc syndrome; sprain-strain disorder thoracic; radiculopathy thoracic spine; chronic pain with idiopathic insomnia. Treatment to date has included physical therapy; urine drug screening; medications. Currently, the PR-2 notes dated 5-27-15 indicated the injured worker complains of neck, mid back, and low back pain described as sharp, stabbing pain with stiffness, weakness, numbness, paresthesia, and generalized discomfort. He reports he has had good, but partial response to treatment. Objective findings as listed as reduced range of motion in the entire spine; reduced sensation in the distribution of the bilateral T8 spinal nerve root; tender, painful bilateral cervical, thoracic and lumbosacral paraspinal muscular spasms were noted; augmented touch-floor gap and reduced bilateral straight-leg raising measurements; reduced sensation and strength in the distribution of the right C6 and right S1 spinal nerve roots and absent right biceps and right ankle deep tendon reflexes. The provider is requesting authorization of Ambien 10mg #30; Prilosec 20mg #30; Soma 350mg #90 and Xanax 0.5mg #90.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Soma 350mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for carisoprodol (Soma), 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 Soma specifically is not recommended for more than 2 to 3 weeks. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the carisoprodol. 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 carisoprodol (Soma) is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG Treatment in Workers Compensation, 5th Edition.

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.

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.

Xanax 0.5mg #90: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 24 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain Chapter, Benzodiazepines.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Xanax (alprazolam), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the benzodiazepines are "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." Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an anti-depressant. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation identifying any objective functional improvement as a result of the use of the medication and no rationale provided for long-term use of the medication despite the CA MTUS recommendation against long-term use. Benzodiazepines should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Xanax (alprazolam) is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68-69 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter, Proton Pump Inhibitors (PPIs).

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.