

Case Number:	CM14-0163239		
Date Assigned:	10/08/2014	Date of Injury:	01/07/2009
Decision Date:	11/04/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/23/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/03/2014

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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 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 32 year-old patient sustained an injury on 1/7/09 while employed by [REDACTED]. Request(s) under consideration include Diclofenac Sodium 100mg #60 and Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #60. Diagnoses included chronic cervicgia; bilateral upper extremity radicular and neuropathic pain; bilateral carpal and cubital tunnel syndrome, dependence on medications. Conservative care has included medications, therapy, and modified activities/rest. Medications of Hydrocodone, muscle relaxants, and NSAID allow for functionality and maintenance for pain relief. The provider noted oral medications are well-tolerated without report of acute exacerbation of pain, breakthrough pain, side effects, or GI disease. Exam showed full range of movement in the bilateral upper extremities and neck with intact normal neurological findings. The request(s) for Diclofenac Sodium 100mg #60 and Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #60 were non-certified on 9/23/14 citing guidelines criteria and lack of medical necessity.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Diclofenac Sodium 100mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 22.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatories are the traditional first line of treatment, to reduce pain so activity and functional restoration can resume, but long-term use may not be warranted. Monitoring of the NSAID's functional benefit is advised as long term use of NSAIDS beyond a few weeks may actually retard muscle and connective tissue healing. Available reports submitted have not adequately addressed the indication to continue this NSAID for this chronic injury nor its functional efficacy derived from treatment already rendered. There is no report of acute flare or new injuries. NSAIDs is a second line medication after use of acetaminophen. The Diclofenac Sodium 100mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #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): 64-65.

Decision rationale: Guidelines do not recommend long-term use of this muscle relaxant for this chronic injury of 2009. Additionally, the efficacy in clinical trials has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication or medical need for this treatment and there is no report of significant clinical findings, acute flare-up or new injury to support for its long-term use. There is no report of functional improvement resulting from its previous treatment to support further use as the patient remains unchanged. The Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.