

Case Number:	CM14-0177382		
Date Assigned:	10/30/2014	Date of Injury:	12/10/2001
Decision Date:	12/08/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/15/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/27/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

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 46-year-old male with a date of injury of December 10, 2001. The mechanism of injury was a motor vehicle accident. The industrially related diagnoses include chronic low back pain, lumbar fusion, and lumbar radiculopathy. The disputed issue is a request for Nuvigil. A utilization review determination dated 10/15/2014 had non-certified the request for Nuvigil 250mg #30. The rationale for this denial was there was "insufficient information to supports its indication or benefit."

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Nuvigil 250mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines- Armodafinil (Nuvigil)

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 Chapter, Armodafinil (Nuvigil)

Decision rationale: The Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, state the following regarding Armodafinil (Nuvigil): "Not recommended solely to counteract sedation

effects of narcotics. Armodafinil is used to treat excessive sleepiness caused by narcolepsy or shift work sleep disorder. It is very similar to Modafinil. Studies have not demonstrated any difference in efficacy and safety between armodafinil and modafinil. (Tembe, 2011) For more information see also Modafinil (Provigil), where it is not recommended solely to counteract sedation effects of narcotics until after first considering reducing excessive narcotic prescribing, and it is noted that there should be heightened awareness for potential abuse of and dependence on this drug. Recently Cephalon produced a campaign advertising Nuvigil's ability to help shift workers stay alert on the job without impeding their ability to sleep during the day. The FDA is conducting an investigation into the possibility that this advertising or promotional information may have violated current regulations. (SEC, 2011)" Regarding the request for Nuvigil, California MTUS and ACOEM do not contain criteria for the use of Nuvigil, ODG states the Nuvigil is not recommended solely to counteract sedation effects of narcotics. Nuvigil is used to treat excessive sleepiness caused by narcolepsy or shift work sleep disorder. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has narcolepsy or shift work sleep disorder. A recent progress note on August 20, 2014 does not indicate in the treatment section a specific rationale for Nuvigil usage. Prior progress notes also do not document a rationale for this Nuvigil usage. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Nuvigil is not medically necessary.