

Case Number:	CM14-0147420		
Date Assigned:	09/15/2014	Date of Injury:	05/26/2011
Decision Date:	10/15/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/18/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/10/2014

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 Medicine 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 is a 32-year-old female patient who reported an industrial injury to the head, left ankle, right arm, and neck on 5/26/2011, over three (3) years ago, attributed to the performance of her usual and customary job tasks reported as a slip and fall down the stairway. The patient is been treated with physical therapy; acupuncture; orthotics; cervical epidural steroid injections, medications, and activity restrictions. The objective findings on examination included tenderness to palpation in the neck, back, shoulder, elbow, and wrist; decreased in range of motion diffusely; some reported weakness. The treatment plan included Flexeril 10 mg #90; Motrin 800 mg #120; Prilosec 20 mg #60; and diclofenac/lidocaine topical compounded cream.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Flexeril 10mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 3 Initial Approaches to Treatment Page(s): 47, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants for pain Page(s): 63-64. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain chapter- medications for chronic pain; muscle relaxants; cyclobenzaprine

Decision rationale: The prescription for Flexeril (cyclobenzaprine) 10 mg #90 is recommended for the short-term treatment of muscle spasms and not for the long-term treatment of chronic pain. The patient has been prescribed muscle relaxers on a long-term basis contrary to the recommendations of the CA MTUS. The patient is prescribed muscle relaxers on a routine basis for chronic pain. The muscle relaxers are directed to the relief of muscle spasms. The chronic use of muscle relaxants is not recommended by the CA MTUS, the ACOEM Guidelines, or the Official Disability Guidelines for the treatment of chronic pain. The use of muscle relaxants are recommended to be prescribed only briefly in a short course of therapy. There is no medical necessity demonstrated for the use of muscle relaxants for more than the initial short-term treatment of muscle spasms. There is a demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription of muscle relaxers on a routine basis for chronic neck and back pain. The cyclobenzaprine was used as an adjunct treatment for muscle and there is demonstrated medical necessity for the Cyclobenzaprine/Flexeril for the cited industrial injury. The continued prescription of a muscle relaxant was not consistent with the evidence-based guidelines. The California MTUS states that cyclobenzaprine is recommended for a short course of therapy. Limited, mixed evidence does not allow for a recommendation for chronic use. Cyclobenzaprine is a skeletal muscle relaxant and a central nervous system depressant with similar effects to tricyclic antidepressants. Evidence-based guidelines state that this medication is not recommended to be used for longer than 2 to 3 weeks. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription of cyclobenzaprine 10 mg #90 for the effects of the industrial injury.

Prilosec 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines section on anti-inflammatory medications Page(s): 67-68. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain Chapter--medications for chronic pain; NSAIDs

Decision rationale: The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines section on anti-inflammatory medications and gastrointestinal symptoms states; "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events." The medical records provided for review do not provide additional details in regards to the above assessment needed for this request. No indication or rationale for gastrointestinal prophylaxis is documented in the records provided. There are no demonstrated or documented GI issues attributed to NSAIDs for this patient. The patient was prescribed Omeprazole routine for prophylaxis with ibuprofen. The protection of the gastric lining from the chemical effects of NSAIDs is appropriately accomplished with the use of the proton pump inhibitors such as Omeprazole. The patient is documented to be taking ibuprofen; however, there was no documented GI risks. There is no industrial indication for the use of Omeprazole due to "stomach issues" or stomach irritation. The proton pump inhibitors provide protection from medication side effects of dyspepsia or stomach discomfort brought on by NSAIDs. The use of Omeprazole is medically necessary if the patient were prescribed conventional NSAIDs and complained of GI issues associated with NSAIDs. Whereas 50% of patient taking NSAIDs may complain of GI upset, it is not clear that the patient was prescribed Omeprazole automatically. The prescribed opioid analgesic, not an NSAID, was accompanied by

a prescription for Omeprazole without documentation of complications. There were no documented GI effects of the NSAIDs to the stomach of the patient and the Omeprazole was dispensed or prescribed routinely. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for the prescription for omeprazole 20 mg #60.

Diclofenac/lidocaine cream (3%, 5%) 150g: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics; anti-inflammatory medications Page(s): 112-113; 22, 67-68. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain chapter--topical analgesics; topical analgesics compounded

Decision rationale: The prescription for compounded topical cream Dicofenac/Lidocaine 3%/5%, 150 g is not medically necessary for the treatment of the patient for pain relief for the orthopedic diagnoses of the patient. There is no clinical documentation submitted to demonstrate the use of the topical gels for appropriate diagnoses or for the recommended limited periods of time. It is not clear that the topical compounded medications are medically necessary in addition to prescribed oral medications. There is no provided subjective/objective evidence that the patient has failed or not responded to other conventional and recommended forms of treatment for relief of the effects of the industrial injury. Only if the subjective/objective findings are consistent with the recommendations of the ODG, then topical use of topical preparations is only recommended for short-term use for specific orthopedic diagnoses. There is no provided rationale supported with objective evidence to support the prescription of the topical compounded cream. There is no documented efficacy of the prescribed topical compounded analgesics with no assessment of functional improvement. The patient is stated to have reduced pain with the topical creams however there is no functional assessment and no quantitative decrease in pain documented. The use of topical NSAIDs is documented to have efficacy for only 2-4 weeks subsequent to injury and thereafter is not demonstrated to be as effective as oral NSAIDs. There is less ability to control serum levels and dosing with the topicals. The patient is not demonstrated to have any GI issue at all with NSAIDs. There is no demonstrated medical necessity for topical NSAIDs for chronic pain for a prolonged period of time. The request for the topical NSAID compounded topical Dicofenac/Lidocaine 3%/5%, 150 g is not medically necessary for the treatment of the patient for the diagnosis of the chronic pain. The use of the topical gels/creams does not provide the appropriate therapeutic serum levels of medications due to the inaccurate dosing performed by rubbing variable amounts of gels on areas that are not precise. The volume applied and the times per day that the gels are applied are variable and do not provide consistent serum levels consistent with effective treatment. There is no medical necessity for the addition of gels to the oral medications in the same drug classes. There is no demonstrated evidence that the topicals are more effective than generic oral medications. The use of compounded topical cream Dicofenac/Lidocaine 3%/5%, 150 g is not supported by the applicable evidence based guidelines as cited above. The continued use of topical NSAIDs for the current clinical conditions is not otherwise warranted or demonstrated to be appropriate. There is no documented objective evidence that the patient requires both the oral medications

and the topical analgesic medication for the treatment of the industrial injury. The prescription for compounded topical crea