

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0050948		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	03/24/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/25/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	02/20/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/17/2015

### 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, Georgia  
 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 61 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/25/2010. He has reported subsequent neck and back pain and was diagnosed with lumbago and cervicalgia. Treatment to date has included oral pain medication, physical therapy, acupuncture and a home exercise program. In a progress note dated 01/31/2014, the injured worker complained of hip and right leg pain. Objective findings were notable for tenderness of the lumbar spine, tenderness of the facet joint, decreased flexion and extension and tenderness of the right sacroiliac joint and positive Patrick's test. Requests for refill of Baclofen, Neurontin and Xanax were made.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Baclofen 10mg #90 with 4 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): 63-66.

**Decision rationale:** The California MTUS allows for the use, with caution, of non-sedating muscle relaxers as second line treatment for acute exacerbations of chronic low back pain. While they may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, most studies show no benefits beyond NSAIDs in pain relief. Efficacy diminishes over time and prolonged use may lead to dependency. There is no recommendation for ongoing use in chronic pain. The medical record in this case does not document an acute exacerbation and the request is for ongoing regular daily use of Baclofen 10 mg #90 with 4 refills. This is not medically necessary and the original UR decision is upheld.

**Neurontin 100mg #60 with 2 refills:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Gabapentin Page(s): 18-19.

**Decision rationale:** California MTUS guidelines state that Gabapentin is effective for treatment for diabetic painful neuropathy and post-herpetic neuralgia. It is considered a first line intervention for neuropathic pain. There is limited evidence to show that gabapentin is effective for post-operative pain where fairly good evidence shows that it reduces need for narcotic pain control. In this case, the gabapentin is prescribed for chronic pain with no evidence or documentation to suggest that the pain is neuropathic. There is no documentation of response to the medication. It is not prescribed in the immediate post-operative period and therefore is not medically necessary.

**Xanax 0.5mg #30:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Benzodiazepines Page(s): 24.

**Decision rationale:** California MTUS guidelines state that benzodiazepines are not recommended for long term use because long term efficacy is unproven and there are risks of dependency. Guidelines generally limit use to 4 weeks. Chronic benzodiazepines are the treatment of choice in very few conditions. Tolerance to hypnotic effects develops rapidly. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Tolerance to anticonvulsant and muscle relaxant effects occurs within weeks. In this case, the claimant has been treated with Xanax for longer than the recommended 4 weeks. Ongoing use of Xanax is not medically indicated.