

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0021285		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/08/2013	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/08/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	02/05/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/19/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/08/2013

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Internal Medicine and is licensed to practice Rhode Island. 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 physician 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### 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 beneficiary presents for symptoms of chronic sinusitis with nasal and post nasal congestion. The date of claim is 7/8/10. She has been having more frequent symptoms and infection since she moved to a different area of the office building. She also works with chemicals in a toxicology lab. She has had two CAT scans of the sinuses which show septal deviation and some chronic sinusitis changes. The beneficiary is seeking authorization for the use of multiple agents to resolve her symptomology. She has also had allergy testing with multiple environmental allergies.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Vitamin C maintenance 2000mg:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Tanphaichitr V. Modern Nutrition in Health and Medicine, 9th, Shils M (Ed), Lippincott, Philadelphia 2000. p.381.

**Decision rationale:** There is no scientifically valid evidence in double blind placebo controlled trials for the efficacy of Vitamin C (ascorbic acid) at any level. It has not been shown to provide

symptomatic relief. Its use can be associated with side effects. I refer to the referenced guidelines in rendering my decision.

**Additional Vitamin C 2000mg: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Tanphaichitr V. Modern Nutrition in Health and Medicine, 9th, Shils M(Ed), Lippincott, Philadelphia 2000. p.381.

**Decision rationale:** The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale: There is no scientifically proven benefit to any dosage of Vitamin C in treating allergens, the common cold or other disease state. There are no double blind placebo controlled trials that show the efficacy of vitamin C.

**Propolis Spray: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation UptoDate Treatment of allergens Smart Medicine American College of Physicians Propolis.

**Decision rationale:** My search of literature produces no clinically proven trials of Propolis that show any efficacy to this agent. A Medline search reveals no studies that show any efficacy in double blind placebo controlled trials to efficacy for this agent.

**. Mucinex (Guaifenesin) up to 1200mg: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation UptoDate 2013 treatment of allergens and upper respiratory infections.

**Decision rationale:** Mucinex has clinical value as a mucolytic agent in sinus congestion and infection. It has been shown in clinical trials to have benefit in the short term and not meant for chronic use.

**Pseudoephedrine: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation UpTo Date 2013 Treatment of common cold and allergens.

**Decision rationale:** There is in clinically proven evidence for the use of pseudoephedrine either acutely or chronically. There are no trials proving its efficacy in a Medline search or on UpToDate or Smart Medicine of the American College of Physicians.

**. Afrin Nasal Spray: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation UpToDate 2013 Afrin nasal spray

**Decision rationale:** There is no evidence in the medical literature for the efficacy for Afrin nasal spray in any clinical trials. It is not indicated for the treatment of acute upper respiratory illness or chronic use.

**Safine Sinus Rinse: Upheld**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation UpToDate 2013 Over the counter treatment of "common cold or congestion".

**Decision rationale:** There is no clinical evidence for the use of Safine sinus rinse. No trials have demonstrated any efficacy. A survey of the literature in a PubMed search yields no evidence for its use. See above reference.

**Cetirizine 10mg: Overturned**

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation 1. Dykewicz MS, Fineman S, Skoner DP, et al. Diagnosis and management of rhinitis: complete guidelines of the Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters in Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. American Academy of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol

**Decision rationale:** The literature does support the use of this medication for allergic rhinitis and common cold type symptoms in addition to use with urticaria. There appears to be therapeutic benefit as an antihistamine. It will decrease symptomology, though not hasten the course of the disease.

**Elderberry Extract:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation UpToDate 2013 [www.nccam.nih.gov/health/backgrounds/wholemed.htm](http://www.nccam.nih.gov/health/backgrounds/wholemed.htm) (Accessed on February 11, 2010). Radix glycyrrhizae. In: WHO monographs on selected medicinal plants, Vol. 1, World Health Organization, Geneva 1999. p.183. The State Pharmacopoeia Commission of Th

**Decision rationale:** A review of the above literature does not reveal any placebo controlled trials that show the efficacy of this extract in treatment of allergies or viral syndromes. This is not considering medically necessary and not within the standards of care.

**Propolis Paste:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation : UptoDate Treatment of allergens - Smart Medicine American College of Physicians Propolis

**Decision rationale:** There is no clinical evidence for the use of the above agent. A literature search finds no studies in double blind placebo controlled trial that show the efficacy of this agent. This is not medically necessary.