

Case Number:	CM15-0147755		
Date Assigned:	08/10/2015	Date of Injury:	04/09/2010
Decision Date:	09/17/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/29/2015

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, Georgia
 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 37 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 04-09-2010. On provider visit dated 06-16-2015 the injured worker has reported left hip pain, sleeping difficulty, numbness, tingling, and symptoms of anxiety and depression. On examination of the left hip range of motion was noted as forward flexion 115 degrees, internal and external rotation 60 degrees and adduction 45 degrees and abduction was 45 degrees. There was a flexion contracture of 5 degrees on the left. Pain with internal and external rotation and tenderness over trochanteric bursa was noted on the left. The diagnoses have included left hip strain-sprain, lumbar spine sprain-strain rule out herniated nucleus pulposus with radiculopathy, left sacroiliac strain-sprain and symptom anxiety and depression. Treatment to date has included medication. The provider requested Ativan, Ambien, Norco and MS Contin.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ativan 1mg 1 PO #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Section 2 Page(s): 24.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS guidelines state that benzodiazepines are not recommended for long term use because long term efficacy is unproven and there are risks of dependency. Guidelines generally limit use to 4 weeks. 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. In this case, the claimant has been treated with Ativan for longer than the recommended 4 weeks. Ongoing use of Ativan is not medically necessary.

Ambien 10mg 1 PO QHS #30: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS is silent on the use of Ambien. ODG addresses insomnia treatments in the section on pain. ODG states that treatment should be based on the etiology of the insomnia. Pharmacologic agents should be used only after a careful investigation for cause of sleep disturbance. Primary insomnia should be treated with pharmacologic agents while secondary insomnia may be treated with pharmacologic and/or psychological measures. It is important to address all four components of sleep - sleep onset, sleep maintenance, sleep quality and next day function. Ambien is not FDA approved for use greater than 35 days. In this case, the medical records indicate that Ambien has been used for more than 35 days. Therefore, there is no documentation of the medical necessity of treatment with Ambien and the UR denial is upheld.

Norco 10/325mg 1 PO Q4-6H #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Section 2 Page(s): 74-89.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS allows for the use of opioid medication, such as Norco, for the management of chronic pain and outlines clearly the documentation that would support the need for ongoing use of an opioid. These steps include documenting pain and functional improvement using validated measures at 6 months intervals, documenting the presence or absence of any adverse effects, documenting the efficacy of any other treatments and of any other medications used in pain treatment. The medical record in this case does not use any

validated method of recording the response of pain to the opioid medication or of documenting any functional improvement. It does not address the efficacy of concomitant medication therapy. Therefore, the record does not support medical necessity of ongoing opioid therapy with Norco.

MS Contin 30mg 1 PO BID #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Section 2 Page(s): 74-89.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS allows for the use of opioid medication, such as MS Contin, for the management of chronic pain and outlines clearly the documentation that would support the need for ongoing use of an opioid. These steps include documenting pain and functional improvement using validated measures at 6 months intervals, documenting the presence or absence of any adverse effects, documenting the efficacy of any other treatments and of any other medications used in pain treatment. The medical record in this case does not use any validated method of recording the response of pain to the opioid medication or of documenting any functional improvement. It does not address the efficacy of concomitant medication therapy. Therefore, the record does not support medical necessity of ongoing opioid therapy with MS Contin.