

Case Number:	CM15-0024526		
Date Assigned:	02/17/2015	Date of Injury:	02/23/2011
Decision Date:	04/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/09/2015

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, Pain Management

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 a work related injury on 2/23/11. The diagnoses have included shoulder and upper arm sprain/strain, lumbar sprain/strain, neck sprain/strain, cervical radiculopathy, bilateral shoulder impingement, lumbosacral radiculopathy and bilateral wrist tendonitis/bursitis. Treatments to date have included left knee surgery, left shoulder surgery, physical therapy, use of wrist splints, work modifications and oral medications. In the Qualified Medical Re-Evaluation dated 9/9/14, the injured worker complained of left shoulder pain. H rated this pain an 8-9/10. He complained of pain in his left knee. H rated this pain a 5-6/10. The left shoulder knee and shoulder pain is made worse by certain activities. He had stiffness in his left shoulder. He got some relief with medications and rest. In a PR-2 dated 2/3/15, the injured worker had tenderness, spasm and guarding in the cervical and lumbar musculature with decreased range of motion in both areas. He stated that pain medication works to decrease pain and helps to improve functional ability. On 1/20/15, Utilization Review non-certified retrospective requests for Ambien 5mg., #30, Norco 25/325mg., #30 and Prilosec 20 mg., #90. The California MTUS, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, and ODG were cited.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Ambien 5 mg #30 with a dos of 10/16/2014: 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).

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Ambien, California MTUS guidelines are silent regarding the use of sedative hypnotic agents. ODG recommends the short-term use (usually two to six weeks) of pharmacological agents only after careful evaluation of potential causes of sleep disturbance. They go on to state the failure of sleep disturbances to resolve in 7 to 10 days, may indicate a psychiatric or medical illness. Within the documentation available for review, there is no clear description of the patient's insomnia, no statement indicating what behavioral treatments have been attempted, and no statement indicating how the patient has responded to treatment. Furthermore, there is no indication that the medication is being used for short-term treatment as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Ambien is not medically necessary.

Retrospective Norco 25/325 mg #30 with a dos of 10/16/2014: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use Page(s): 76-80.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Norco, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Norco is not medically necessary.

Retrospective Prilosec 20 mg #90 with a dos of 10/16/2014: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Prilosec, California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Prilosec is not medically necessary.