

Case Number:	CM14-0164748		
Date Assigned:	10/09/2014	Date of Injury:	12/27/2012
Decision Date:	11/10/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/26/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/07/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in anesthesia, has a subspecialty in pain medicine and is licensed to practice in Massachusetts. 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/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:

According to the documents available for review, the patient is a 32 year old female. The date of injury is December 27, 2012. The patient sustained an injury to the back, hips and left lower extremity. The specific mechanism of injury was not fully elaborated on in the notes available for review. The patient currently complains of pain in low back, left knee and left leg worse with ambulation in movement. The patient is maintained on the multimodal pain medication regimen including Norflex . A request for Norflex was denied

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Orphenadrine (Norflex) 100mg QTY: 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 63 & 66.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Norflex Page(s): 65.

Decision rationale: The MTUS, recommends non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (VanTulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and

increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. These drugs should be used with caution in patients driving motor vehicles or operating heavy machinery. Drugs with the most limited published evidence in terms of clinical effectiveness include chlorzoxazone, methocarbamol, dantrolene and baclofen. (Chou, 2004) According to a recent review in American Family Physician, skeletal muscle relaxants are the most widely prescribed drug class for musculoskeletal conditions (18.5% of prescriptions), and the most commonly prescribed antispasmodic agents are carisoprodol, cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, and methocarbamol, but despite their popularity, skeletal muscle relaxants should not be the primary drug class of choice for musculoskeletal conditions. (See2, 2008) According to the documents available for review, the patient has been utilizing norflex for long-term treatment of chronic pain condition. This is in contrast to the MTUS recommendations for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established