

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0064353		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/27/2004
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/05/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/06/2015

### 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: Texas, New York, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 applicant is a represented 31-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic neck pain, posttraumatic headaches, insomnia, and sleep disturbance reportedly associated with an industrial injury of May 27, 2004. In a Utilization Review report dated March 26, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for sumatriptan (Imitrex). The claims administrator referenced a progress note dated February 13, 2015 in its determination and an RFA form dated March 24, 2015. The claims administrator contented that the attending provider failed to establish evidence of benefit with ongoing Imitrex usage. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On February 13, 2015, the applicant reported issues with depression and worsening migraine headaches immediately after delivery of her child. Imitrex was endorsed for breakthrough migraines. The attending provider stated that he would temporarily withhold Topamax while the applicant was breastfeeding her young child. Cymbalta and Ambien were also renewed. The applicant was experiencing 5 to 10 migraines a month, it was reported.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Sumatriptan Succinate 100mg #24 with 1 refill:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Head Procedure Summary Online Version.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 47. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation U.S. Food and Drug Administration 1 PRESCRIBING INFORMATION 2 IMITREX® 3 (sumatriptan succinate) 4 Tablets 173 INDICATIONS AND USAGE 174 IMITREX Tablets are indicated for the acute treatment of migraine attacks with or without 175 aura in adults.

**Decision rationale:** Yes, the request for sumatriptan (Imitrex) was medically necessary, medically appropriate, and indicated here. The MTUS Guidelines in ACOEM Chapter 3, page 47 does stipulate that an attending provider incorporate some discussion of efficacy of medications for the particular condition for which it has been prescribed into his choice of recommendations so as to ensure proper usage and to manage expectations. Here, the attending provider did state that Imitrex was intended for use for breakthrough migraine headaches. The applicant had apparently developed worsening, post-partum migraine headaches, it was reported on February 13, 2015. The applicant was experiencing somewhere between 5 and 10 breakthrough migraines a month. Usage of sumatriptan (Imitrex) was indicated to combat the same, as the FDA notes that Imitrex is indicated in the treatment of acute migraine attacks, as were apparently present here. Therefore, the request was medically necessary.