

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0161522		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/27/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/05/2008
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/30/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/20/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/17/2015

### 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  
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 51 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on November 5, 2008, incurring low back, abdomen, and groin and right hip injuries. A lumbar spine Magnetic Resonance Imaging revealed disc protrusions. He was diagnosed with lumbar disc disease, lumbar radiculopathy, and an inguinal hernia. Treatment included pain medications, surgical hernia repair, anti-inflammatory drugs, antidepressants, antianxiety medications, psychotherapy, physical therapy and work modifications. Currently, the injured worker complained of persistent low back pain radiating into his lower extremities. The injured worker developed depression and anxiety secondary to the chronic constant pain. The treatment plan that was requested for authorization included a prescription for Clonazepam.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Clonazepam 1 mg #90:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 24, 66.

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

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on benzodiazepines states: Benzodiazepines-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. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic, anxiolytic, anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant. 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. (Baillargeon, 2003) (Ashton, 2005). The chronic long-term use of this class of medication is recommended in very few conditions per the California MTUS. There is no evidence however of failure of first line agent for the treatment of anxiety or insomnia in the provided documentation. For this reason the request is not medically necessary.