

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0063908		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/09/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/25/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/08/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/27/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/03/2015

### 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 45 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 08/25/2011. He has reported subsequent back pain and was diagnosed with herniated nucleus pulposus of the lumbar spine, canal stenosis of the lumbar spine, chondromalacia of the left knee and lumbar radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication, lumbar epidural steroid injection and surgery. In a progress note dated 03/02/2015, the injured worker complained of neck, back, shoulder, bilateral hand, bilateral hip, bilateral knee and bilateral ankle pain. Objective findings were notable for antalgic gait on the left, tenderness over the paraspinous muscles of the thoracic and lumbar spine with spasm and reduced range of motion of the lumbar spine and joint line tenderness of the medial and lateral aspects of the left knee. A request for authorization of Norco and Ambien was made.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Ambien 10mg, #30, 2 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 (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Zolpidem (Ambien; 1/2), pages 877-878.

**Decision rationale:** Per the ODG, this non-benzodiazepines CNS depressant should not be used for prolonged periods of time and is the treatment of choice in very few conditions. The tolerance to hypnotic effects develops rapidly with anxiolytic effects occurring within months; limiting its use to 4 weeks as long-term use may actually increase anxiety. While sleeping pills, so-called minor tranquilizers, and anti-anxiety agents are commonly prescribed in chronic pain, pain specialists rarely, if ever, recommend them for long-term use. They can be habit-forming, and they may impair function and memory more than opioid pain relievers. There is also concern that they may increase pain and depression over the long-term. Submitted reports have not identified any clinical findings or specific sleep issues such as number of hours of sleep, difficulty getting to sleep or staying asleep or how the use of this sedative/hypnotic has provided any functional improvement if any from treatment rendered. The reports have not demonstrated any clinical findings or confirmed diagnoses of sleep disorders to support its use for this chronic injury. There is no failed trial of behavioral interventions or proper pain management as the patient continues on opiates with stated pain relief to hinder any sleep issues. The Ambien 10mg, #30, 2 refills is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Norco 10/325mg, #30:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

**Decision rationale:** Per the MTUS Guidelines cited, opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. There is no evidence presented of random drug testing or utilization of pain contract to adequately monitor for narcotic safety, efficacy, and compliance. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Norco 10/325mg, #30 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

