

Case Number:	CM15-0126059		
Date Assigned:	07/08/2015	Date of Injury:	01/10/2013
Decision Date:	08/05/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/03/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2015

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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

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 64 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 1/10/13. The injured worker has complaints of neck and low back pain. The documentation noted tenderness across the lumbar paraspinal muscles and straight leg raise test is positive on the right at 60 degrees and negative on the left. The diagnoses have included discogenic cervical condition with disc disease from C3 through C7 and right -sided radiculopathy and status post fusion at L4- L5. Treatment to date has included lumbar fusion; norco; lunesta; flexeril; tramadol and nalfon. The request was for lunesta 2mg #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lunesta 2mg #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, Pain Chapter Official Disability Guidelines, Mental Illness and Stress Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Insomnia Treatment, pages 535-536.

Decision rationale: Hypnotics are not included among the multiple medications noted to be optional adjuvant medications, per the Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Pain. Additionally, Lunesta is a non-benzodiazepine-like, Schedule IV controlled substance. Long-term use is not recommended as efficacy is unproven with a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic and anxiolytic. Chronic use is 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. Submitted documents have not demonstrated any specific functional improvement including pain relief with decreased pharmacological profile, decreased medical utilization, increased ADLs and work function, or quantified hours of sleep as a result from treatment rendered for this chronic injury of January 2013. The reports have not identified any specific clinical findings or confirmed diagnoses of sleep disorders nor is there any noted failed trial of behavioral interventions or proper sleep hygiene regimen to support its continued use. The Lunesta 2mg #30 is not medically necessary and appropriate.