

Case Number:	CM15-0017579		
Date Assigned:	02/05/2015	Date of Injury:	02/16/2011
Decision Date:	03/30/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/13/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/29/2015

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: 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 65 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 02/16/2011. She has reported subsequent neck and shoulder pain and was diagnosed with cervical sprain and bilateral shoulder impingement syndrome. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication, injections and surgery. In a progress note dated 01/06/2015, the injured worker complained of continued neck and left shoulder pain as well as difficulty sleeping. Objective physical examination findings were notable for discomfort in the left paracervical muscles and trapezii with neck movement, tenderness over the left greater tuberosity, anterior capsule and proximal 1/3 of the biceps tendon and AC joint with reduced range of motion. A request for authorization of Norco and Ambien was made. On 01/13/2015, Utilization Review non-certified requests for Norco and Ambien, noting that the records did not clearly reflect continued analgesia or functional benefit with Norco and that guidelines did not recommend chronic use of Ambien. MTUS, ODG and FDA guidelines were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Norco 5/325mg #120, 1 tab four (4) times per day, as needed: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Criteria for use of opioids Page(s): 76-79.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Norco (Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen) is a synthetic opioid indicated for the pain management but not recommended as a first line oral analgesic. In addition and according to MTUS guidelines, ongoing use of opioids should follow specific rules: <(a) Prescriptions from a single practitioner taken as directed, and all prescriptions from a single pharmacy. (b) The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. (c) Office: Ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use, and side effects. Four domains have been proposed as most relevant for ongoing monitoring of chronic pain patients on opioids: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychosocial functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant (or non adherent) drug-related behaviors. These domains have been summarized as the "4 A's" (analgesia, activities of daily living, adverse side effects, and aberrant drug taking behaviors). The monitoring of these outcomes over time should affect therapeutic decisions and provide a framework> According to the patient file, there is no objective documentation of pain and functional improvement to justify continuous use of Norco. Norco was used for longtime without documentation of functional improvement or evidence of return to work or improvement of activity of daily living. Therefore, the prescription of Norco 5/325mg #120 is not medically necessary.

Ambien 5mg #30 1 tab every night at bedtime by mouth: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG 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>. Ambien 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 recent sleep issues with the patient. Therefore, the prescription of Ambien 5mg #30 is not medically necessary.

