

Case Number:	CM15-0014203		
Date Assigned:	01/29/2015	Date of Injury:	09/23/2009
Decision Date:	04/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/30/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/26/2015

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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

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 48 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on September 23, 2009. He has reported lower back pain and left shoulder pain. The diagnoses have included displaced lumbar spine intervertebral disc, shoulder impingement, insomnia and anxiety. Treatment to date was documented as medications. A progress note dated November 10, 2014 indicates a chief complaint of neck pain, left shoulder pain radiating to the left arm, and lower back pain. Physical examination showed cervical spine tenderness with decreased range of motion, left shoulder tenderness with decreased range of motion, and lumbar spine tenderness. The treating physician is requesting prescriptions for Flurbiprofen/Cyclobenzaprine/Lidocaine compound and Relafen. On December 30, 2014 Utilization Review denied the request for the prescriptions citing the MTUS chronic pain medical treatment guidelines and ODG.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

FCL (Flurbiprofen 20%, Cyclobenzaprine 4%, Lidocaine 5% 180gm): Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111,112.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS with regard to Flurbiprofen (p112), "These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. (Mason, 2004) Indications: Osteoarthritis and tendinitis, in particular, that of the knee and elbow or other joints that are amenable to topical treatment: Recommended for short-term use (4-12 weeks). There is little evidence to utilize topical NSAIDs for treatment of osteoarthritis of the spine, hip or shoulder." Flurbiprofen may be indicated. Per MTUS CPMTG p113, "There is no evidence for use of any other muscle relaxant as a topical product." Cyclobenzaprine is not indicated. Regarding topical lidocaine, MTUS states (p112) "Neuropathic pain: Recommended for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of first-line therapy (tricyclic or SNRI anti-depressants or an AED such as gabapentin or Lyrica). Non-neuropathic pain: Not recommended. There is only one trial that tested 4% lidocaine for treatment of chronic muscle pain. The results showed there was no superiority over placebo. (Scudds, 1995). "The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that topical medications are "Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenic amines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended."Regarding the use of multiple medications, MTUS p60 states "Only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded. (Mens, 2005) The recent AHRQ review of comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesics for osteoarthritis concluded that each of the analgesics was associated with a unique set of benefits and risks, and no currently available analgesic was identified as offering a clear overall advantage compared with the others." Therefore, it would be optimal to trial each medication individually. Because topical cyclobenzaprine is not indicated, the compound is not recommended. This request is not medically necessary.

Relafen (Nabumetone) 750mg #90: Overturned

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67,68.

Decision rationale: With regard to the use of NSAIDs for chronic low back pain, the MTUS CPMTG states "Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another." "Low back pain (chronic): Both acetaminophen and NSAIDs have been recommended as first line therapy for low back pain. There is insufficient evidence to recommend one medication over the other. Selection should be made on a case-by-case basis based on weighing efficacy vs. side effect profile." "I respectfully disagree with the UR physician. The MTUS does not mandate documentation of significant functional benefit for the continued use of NSAIDs. Nabumetome is indicated for the injured worker's low back pain. The request is medically necessary.