

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM14-0091688 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 09/12/2014   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 10/12/2000 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 10/06/2014   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 05/20/2014 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 06/17/2014 |

### 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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in California. 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:

This 43 year-old patient sustained an injury on 10/12/2000 while employed by [REDACTED]. Request(s) under consideration include Cyclobenzaprine 10 mg # 60 3 refills. Diagnoses include Sacroiliitis; s/p lumbar fusion. The patient continues to treat for chronic ongoing low back symptoms. Report of 4/14/14 from the provider noted the patient with persistent low back pain. Medications list Hydrocodone, Gabapentin, Methadone, and Cyclobenzaprine providing 60-80% decreased pain, spasm. Exam showed lumbar spine with paraspinal spasm, stiffness; limited range secondary to fusion and pain; dysesthesia at bilateral L4 dermatomes; and 5/5 motor strength throughout bilateral lower extremities. The patient has been prescribed medications for at about 1 year without change. The request(s) for Cyclobenzaprine 10 mg # 60 3 refills was non-certified on 5/20/14 citing guidelines criteria and lack of medical necessity.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Cyclobenzaprine 10 mg # 60 3 refills:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants Page(s): 128.

**Decision rationale:** This 43 year-old patient sustained an injury on 10/12/2000 while employed by [REDACTED]. Request(s) under consideration include Cyclobenzaprine 10 mg # 60 3 refills. Diagnoses include Sacroiliitis; s/p lumbar fusion. The patient continues to treat for chronic ongoing low back symptoms. Report of 4/14/14 from the provider noted the patient with persistent low back pain. Medications list Hydrocodone, Gabapentin, Methadone, and Cyclobenzaprine providing 60-80% decreased pain, spasm. Exam showed lumbar spine with paraspinal spasm, stiffness; limited range secondary to fusion and pain; dysesthesia at bilateral L4 dermatomes; and 5/5 motor strength throughout bilateral lower extremities. The patient has been prescribed medications for at about 1 year without change. The request(s) for Cyclobenzaprine 10 mg # 60 3 refills was non-certified on 5/20/14. Guidelines do not recommend long-term use of this muscle relaxant for this chronic injury of 2000. Additionally, the efficacy in clinical trials has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication or medical need for this treatment and there is no report of significant clinical findings, acute flare-up or new injury to support for its long-term use. There is no report of functional improvement resulting from its previous treatment to support further use as the patient remains unchanged. The Cyclobenzaprine 10 mg # 60 3 refills is not medically necessary and appropriate.