

Case Number:	CM15-0074614		
Date Assigned:	04/24/2015	Date of Injury:	11/20/1998
Decision Date:	05/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/20/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/20/2015

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: North Carolina, Georgia
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 male who sustained an industrial injury on 11/20/98. Initial diagnoses and complaints are not available. Treatments to date include medications and bilateral knee surgeries. Diagnostic studies are not addressed. Current complaints include ongoing back and bilateral knee pain. Current diagnoses include severe degenerative joint disease and disc herniation at L5-S1 with nerve entrapment at the right S1 nerve root. In a progress note dated 03/04/15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as medications including MS Contin, oxycodone, Ambien, flexeril, and Mobic. The requested treatments are Ambien and Flexeril.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Ambien 10mg #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) Pain, Insomnia treatments.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS is silent on the use of Ambien. ODG addresses insomnia treatments in the section on pain. ODG states that treatment should be based on the etiology of the insomnia. Pharmacologic agents should be used only after a careful investigation for cause of sleep disturbance. Primary insomnia should be treated with pharmacologic agents while secondary insomnia may be treated with pharmacologic and/or psychological measures. It is important to address all four components of sleep - sleep onset, sleep maintenance, sleep quality and next day function. Ambien is not FDA approved for use greater than 35 days. In this case, the medical records do not describe investigation of causes of insomnia nor is response to treatment with Ambien documented. Therefore, there is no documentation of the medical necessity of treatment with Ambien and the UR denial is upheld.

Flexeril 10mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Section 2 Page(s): 63-66.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS allows for the use, with caution, of non sedating muscle relaxers as second line treatment for acute exacerbations of chronic low back pain. While they may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, most studies show no benefits beyond NSAIDs in pain relief. Efficacy diminishes over time and prolonged use may lead to dependency. There is no recommendation for ongoing use in chronic pain. The medical record in this case does not document an acute exacerbation and the request is for ongoing regular daily use of Flexeril. This is not medically necessary and the original UR decision is upheld.