

Case Number:	CM14-0202163		
Date Assigned:	12/12/2014	Date of Injury:	03/13/2014
Decision Date:	02/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/18/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/03/2014

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 Family Practice and is licensed to practice in North Carolina. 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:

The patient is a 43-year-old with a reported injury date of 03/12/2014. The patient has diagnoses of lumbar sprain/strain, upper arm joint pain, forearm pain and lower leg pain. The injuries occurred when the patient was unloading a 300-400 pound stone and a co-worker dropped the stone onto the patient. Per the most recent progress notes provided for review from the primary treating physician dated 11/04/2014, the patient had complaints of continued and unchanged pain in the back, legs, ankles, heels, shoulders and arms. The physical exam noted no specific abnormalities. Treatment plan recommendations included aqua therapy, psychology consult and continuation of medications.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 PRESCRIPTION OF CYCLOBENZAPRINE 5MG, #45: 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): 63-66.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend 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) (Van Tulder, 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. (Homik, 2004) The long term chronic use of this medication is not recommended per the California MTUS. There is no provided documentation to show that the medication has been prescribed for short term use to treat acute flares of chronic low back pain. The medication is generally not indicated for periods greater than 2-3 weeks. In the absence of such documentation, the request is not medically necessary and appropriate.

1 PRESCRIPTION OF CYCLOBENZAPRINE - FLEXERIL 5MG, #90: 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): 63-66.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend 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) (Van Tulder, 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. (Homik, 2004) The long term chronic use of this medication is not recommended per the California MTUS. There is no provided documentation to show that the medication has been prescribed for short term use to treat acute flares of chronic low back pain. The medication is generally not indicated for periods greater than 2-3 weeks. In the absence of such documentation, the request cannot be certified.

1 PRESCRIPTION OF GABAPENTIN 600MG #120: Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Gabapentin Page(s): 18.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on Gabapentin states: Gabapentin (Neurontin, Gabarone, generic available) has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain. (Backonja, 2002) (ICSI, 2007)

(Knotkova, 2007)(Eisenberg, 2007) (Attal, 2006) This RCT concluded that gabapentin monotherapy appears to be efficacious for the treatment of pain and sleep interference associated with diabetic peripheral neuropathy and exhibits positive effects on mood and quality of life. (Backonja, 1998) It has been given FDA approval for treatment of post-herpetic neuralgia. The number needed to treat (NNT) for overall neuropathic pain is 4. It has a more favorable side-effect profile than Carbamazepine, with a number needed to harm of 2.5. (Wiffen2-Cochrane, 2005) (Zaremba, 2006) Gabapentin in combination with morphine has been studied for treatment of diabetic neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia. When used in combination the maximum tolerated dosage of both drugs was lower than when each was used as a single agent and better analgesia occurred at lower doses of each. (Gilron-NEJM, 2005) Recommendations involving combination therapy require further study. This medication is indicated for neuropathic pain as a first line agent. The patient had an EMG in 07/2014 which showed S1 radiculopathy. Therefore the medication is indicated and the request is medically necessary and appropriate.

1 PRESCRIPTION OF ORPHENADRINE-NORFLEX ER 100MG, #90: 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): 63-66.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend 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) (Van Tulder, 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. (Homik, 2004) The long term chronic use of this medication is not recommended per the California MTUS. There is no provided documentation to show that the medication has been prescribed for short term use to treat acute flares of chronic low back pain. The medication is generally not indicated for periods greater than 2-3 weeks. In the absence of such documentation, the request is not medically necessary and appropriate.