

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0164109		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/08/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/09/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/04/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/02/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/06/2014

### 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 Occupational 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:

There were 68 pages provided for this review. The claimant is described as a 43-year-old man who fell off a 25 feet high elevator shaft on April 9, 2012. He had a pelvic fracture. Multiple medicines were requested. On April 11, 2012, he had a pelvic open reduction internal fixation. The MRI from June 20, 2012 showed hypertrophic changes, disc bulge, central canal stenosis, lateral stenosis and neural foraminal narrowing. Medication as of March 6, 2013 included Neurontin, Flexeril and Norco. He had left iliosacral screw removal on May 10, 2013 and had a lumbar epidural steroid injection as well. As of August 1, 2014 he continued with low back and pelvic pain. He continues to take anti-inflammatories. He has and antalgic gait and paraspinal spasm.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**90 tablets of Flexeril 10mg:** 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 8 C.C.R. 9792.20- 9792.26 Page(s): 41-42 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** The MTUS recommends Flexeril (cyclobenzaprine) for a short course of therapy. The effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. Treatment should be brief. The addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended. In this case, there has been no objective functional improvement noted in the long-term use of Flexeril in this claimant. Long term use is not supported. Also, it is being used with other agents, which also is not clinically supported in the MTUS.

**90 tablets of Norco 10/325mg:** 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 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 -9792. Page(s): 88 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** In regards to Opiates, Long term use, the MTUS poses several analytical questions such as has the diagnosis changed, what other medications is the patient taking, are they effective, producing side effects, what treatments have been attempted since the use of opioids, and what is the documentation of pain and functional improvement and compare to baseline. These are important issues, and they have not been addressed in this case. There especially is no documentation of functional improvement with the regimen. The request for long-term opiate usage is not medically necessary per MTUS guideline review.

**Compound cream:** 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 8 C.C.R. 9792.20- 9792.26 Page(s): 111 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Per the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page 111 of 127, the MTUS notes topical analgesic compounds are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Experimental treatments should not be used for claimant medical care. MTUS notes they are primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed, but in this case, it is not clear what primary medicines had been tried and failed. It is actually not clear what medicines make up this requested compound. Also, 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 certifiable. This compounded medicine contains several medicines untested in the peer review literature for effectiveness of use topically. Moreover, the MTUS notes that the use of these compounded agents requires knowledge of the specific analgesic effect of each agent and how it will be useful for the specific therapeutic goal required. The provider did not describe each of the agents, and how they would be useful in this claimant's case for specific goals. The request is not medically necessary.

