

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0021475		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/11/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/30/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/31/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/15/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	02/04/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Michigan, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

### 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 59 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 5/30/2013. He reports being knocked down while escaping a burning building and having pain in the right knee, arm and lower back pain. Diagnoses include lower leg joint pain, right sciatica, right posterior medial meniscal tear, lumbar 4-sacral 1 disc and facet injury, right radial and ulnar neuritis and lateral epicondylitis of the elbow. Treatments to date include right knee surgery, physical therapy, injections, home exercises and medication management. A progress note from the treating provider dated 12/1/2014 indicates the injured worker reported right knee pain. On 1/15/2015, Utilization Review non-certified the request for Ambien CR 12.5mg at bedtime #30 with 4 refills, knee brace and elbow brace, citing Official Disability Guidelines and non-MTUS/ACOEM and Official Disability Guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Ambien CR 12.5mg po qhs #30 x4 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines- online version- Pain Chapter- Insomnia Treatment

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Non-Benzodiazepine sedative-hypnotics (Benzodiazepine-receptor agonists (<http://worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/pain.htm>

**Decision rationale:** According to ODG guidelines, “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 means they have potential for abuse and dependency”. Lunesta is not recommended for long-term use to treat sleep problems. Furthermore, there is no documentation of the use of non pharmacologic treatment for the patient's sleep issue. There is no documentation and characterization of any recent sleep issues with the patient. Therefore, the prescription of Prospective request for Ambien CR 12.5mg po qhs #30 x4 refill is not medically necessary.

**Tommy cooper knee brace:** 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 KNEE BRACE <http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html>

**Decision rationale:** Recommended as indicated below. Recommend valgus knee braces for knee OA. Knee braces that produce a valgus moment about the knee markedly reduce the net knee adduction moment and unload the medial compartment of the knee, but could be impractical for many patients. There are no high quality studies that support or refute the benefits of knee braces for patellar instability, ACL tear, or MCL instability, but in some patients a knee brace can increase confidence, which may indirectly help with the healing process. In all cases, braces need to be used in conjunction with a rehabilitation program and are necessary only if the patient is going to be stressing the knee under load. (Bengal, 1997) (Crossley, 2001) (D hondt-Cochrane, 2002) (Miller, 1997) (Yeung-Cochrane, 2002) (Van Tiggelen, 2004) Criteria for the use of knee braces: Prefabricated knee braces may be appropriate in patients with one of the following conditions: 1. Knee instability 2. Ligament insufficiency/deficiency 3. Reconstructed ligament 4. Articular defect repair 5. Avascular necrosis 6. Meniscal cartilage repair 7. Painful failed total knee arthroplasty 8. Painful high tibial osteotomy 9. Painful unicompartmental osteoarthritis 10. Tibial plateau fracture Custom-fabricated knee braces may be appropriate for patients with the following conditions which may preclude the use of a prefabricated model: 1. Abnormal limb contour, such as: a. Valgus [knock-kneed] limb b. Varus [bow-legged] limb c. Tibial varum d. Disproportionate thigh and calf (e.g., large thigh and small calf) e. Minimal muscle mass on which to suspend a brace 2. Skin changes, such as: a. Excessive redundant soft skin b. Thin skin with risk of breakdown (e.g., chronic steroid use) 3. Severe osteoarthritis (grade III or IV) 4. Maximal off-loading of painful or repaired knee compartment (example: heavy patient; significant pain) 5. Severe instability as noted on physical examination of knee. That is no documentation of knee instability in this case. There is no documentation that the brace will be used with a rehabilitation program. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

**Tommy cooper elbow brace:** 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 Splinting (padding) <http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html>

**Decision rationale:** According to ODG guidelines, elbow brace “Recommended for cubital tunnel syndrome (ulnar nerve entrapment), including a splint or foam elbow pad worn at night (to limit movement and reduce irritation), and/or an elbow pad (to protect against chronic irritation from hard surfaces). (Apfel, 2006) (Hong, 1996) Under study for epicondylitis. No definitive conclusions can be drawn concerning effectiveness of standard braces or splints for lateral epicondylitis. (Borkholder, 2004) (Derebery, 2005) (Van De Streek, 2004) (Jensen, 2001) (Struijs, 2001) (Jansen, 1997) If used, bracing or splinting is recommended only as short-term initial treatment for lateral epicondylitis in combination with physical therapy. (Struijs, 2004) (Struijs, 2006) Some positive results have been seen with the development of a new dynamic extensor brace but more trials need to be conducted. Initial results show significant pain reduction, improved functionality of the arm, and improvement in pain-free grip strength. The beneficial effects of the dynamic extensor brace observed after 12 weeks were significantly different from the treatment group that received no brace. The beneficial effects were sustained for another 12 weeks. (Faes, 2006) (Faes2, 2006) Static progressive splinting can help gain additional motion when standard exercises seem stagnant or inadequate, particularly after the original injury. Operative treatment of stiffness was avoided in most patients. (Doornberg, 2006) These results differ from studies testing standard bracing which showed little to no effect on pain. (Wuori, 1998) (AHRQ, 2002) (Gabel, 1999) See also Static progressive stretch therapy and Tennis elbow band”. Allergies no documentation that the patient is suffering from cubital tunnel syndrome. Therefore the request for elbow brace is not medically necessary.