

Case Number:	CM15-0167383		
Date Assigned:	09/08/2015	Date of Injury:	11/05/2012
Decision Date:	10/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/29/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/25/2015

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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 38-year-old female who sustained a work related injury November 5, 2012. Past history included depressive disorder with hospitalization and alcohol dependence in remission. An MRI of the right knee performed April 3, 2015 (report present in the medical record, unclear if non-industrial), revealed longitudinal, horizontal, oblique tearing of the posterior horn and potentially body segment of the medial meniscus with limited evaluation of the anterior horn due to artifact of suspected hardware involving the more anterior aspect of the medial femoral condyle. According to a primary treating physician's progress report, dated July 22, 2015, the injured worker presented for follow-up of neck and back injuries. She had continued neck and back pain, rated 9 out of 10, associated with right upper extremity numbness. She reports evaluation from two orthopedic surgeons regarding right knee pain and is awaiting a third opinion. It is noted, she is receiving medication from primary care physician; Norco, Soma, and Valium. Objective findings included; decreased sensation to light touch C5-8 on the right. An MRI of the cervical spine dated July 2, 2015 revealed disc degeneration of C2-3, C3-4, and C4-5. Diagnoses are chronic pain syndrome; cervical radiculitis; myofascial pain; lumbosacral or thoracic neuritis or radiculitis, unspecified; thoracic outlet syndrome. At issue, is the request for authorization for Cyclobenzaprine and electromyography-nerve conduction velocity bilateral upper extremity.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Electromyography/Nerve Conduction Velocity Bilateral Upper Extremity and lower extremity: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 8 Neck and Upper Back Complaints Page(s): 173-174.

Decision rationale: The ACOEM chapter on neck and upper back complaints and special diagnostic studies states: Criteria for ordering imaging studies are: Emergence of a red flag. Physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. Failure to progress in a strengthening program intended to avoid surgery. Clarification of the anatomy prior to an invasive procedure. Physiologic evidence may be in the form of definitive neurologic findings on physical examination, electrodiagnostic studies, laboratory tests, or bone scans. Unequivocal findings that identify specific nerve compromise on the neurologic examination are sufficient evidence to warrant imaging studies if symptoms persist. When the neurologic examination is less clear, however, further physiologic evidence of nerve dysfunction can be obtained before ordering an imaging study. Electromyography (EMG), and nerve conduction velocities (NCV), including H-reflex tests, may help identify subtle focal neurologic dysfunction in patients with neck or arm symptoms, or both, lasting more than three or four weeks. The assessment may include sensory-evoked potentials (SEPs) if spinal stenosis or spinal cord myelopathy is suspected. If physiologic evidence indicates tissue insult or nerve impairment, consider a discussion with a consultant regarding next steps, including the selection of an imaging test to define a potential cause (magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] for neural or other soft tissue, compute tomography [CT] for bony structures). Additional studies may be considered to further define problem areas. The recent evidence indicates cervical disk annular tears may be missed on MRIs. The clinical significance of such a finding is unclear, as it may not correlate temporally or anatomically with symptoms. The provided documentation does not show any signs of emergence of red flags or subtle physiologic evidence of tissue insult or neurologic dysfunction. There is no mention of planned invasive procedures. There are no subtle neurologic findings listed on the physical exam. For these reasons criteria for special diagnostic testing has not been met per the ACOEM. Therefore, the request is not certified.

Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg quantity 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (for pain).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

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) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended

for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not certified.