MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0074197		
Date Assigned:	04/24/2015	Date of Injury:	08/28/2014
Decision Date:	05/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/16/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/18/2015

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 female, who sustained an industrial injury on 08/27/2012. She reported complaints of pain to the lower back, bilateral hips, and right knee secondary to lifting 30 pound boxes and placing them overheard while she is on her tiptoes. The injured worker was diagnosed as having right knee sprain, right internal knee derangement, lumbar sprain, lumbar radiculitis, and insomnia. Treatment to date has included medication regimen, physical therapy, and home exercise program. In a progress note dated 01/21/2015 the treating physician reports an increase in pain of the right knee, right ankle, and lumbar spine with radiating pain to the bilateral legs and buttocks region and rates the pain at its worst a nine on a scale of zero to ten. The documentation provided did not contain the requested treatments of Voltaren gel 1% with a quantity of 100gm and Ambien 5mg with a quantity of 30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Voltaren gel 1% #100gm: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 112.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 111-112 of 127.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Voltaren gel, guidelines state that topical NSAIDs are recommended for short-term use. Oral NSAIDs contain significantly more guideline support, provided there are no contraindications to the use of oral NSAIDs. Within the documentation available for review, there's no indication that the patient has obtained any specific analgesic effect (in terms of percent reduction in pain, or reduced NRS) or specific objective functional improvement from the use of Voltaren gel. Additionally, there is no documentation that the patient would be unable to tolerate oral NSAIDs, which would be preferred, or that the Voltaren is for short term use, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested Voltaren gel is not medically necessary.

Ambien 5mg #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.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation OFFICIAL DISABILITY GUIDELINES (ODG) Chronic Pain, Sleep Medication, Insomnia treatment.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for zolpidem (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 current description of the patient's insomnia, no discussion regarding what behavioral treatments have been attempted, and no statement indicating how the patient has responded to Ambien treatment. Furthermore, there is no indication that Ambien is being used for short term use as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested zolpidem (Ambien) is not medically necessary.