

Case Number:	CM14-0179949		
Date Assigned:	11/04/2014	Date of Injury:	01/17/2014
Decision Date:	12/09/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/24/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/29/2014

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 North Carolina. 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:

The patient is a 37-year-old with a reported date of injury of 01/17/2014. The patient has the diagnoses of lumbosacral sprain/strain, cervical strain/sprain, HNP C5/6, sacral mass and swan neck deformity of the left 4th digit. Per the most recent progress notes provided for review from the primary treating physician dated 10/20/2014, the patient had complaints of worsening finger pain and continued stable neck and back pain. The physical exam noted weakness and numbness along the left C6 dermatome, positive cervical and lumbar tenderness, decreased cervical and lumbar range of motion and positive left Spurling's sign. The treatment plan recommendations included home exercise program, urine drug screen, continuation of medications and topical analgesic cream.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retro DOS 10/20/14 Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg Qty: 60.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 41, 64.

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) Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril, Fexmid, generic available): Recommended for a short course of therapy. Limited, mixed-evidence does not allow for a recommendation for chronic use. The long term chronic use of this medication is not recommended per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the acute flare up of chronic low back pain. The specific use of this medication for greater than 3 weeks is not recommended per the California MTUS. The criteria set forth above for its use has not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

Retro DOS 10/20/14 Pantoprazole 20mg Qty: 60.00: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID Page(s): 68.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID use and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDS to develop gastroduodenal lesions. Recommendations: Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g., Ibuprofen, Naproxen, etc.) Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease: (1) A non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg omeprazole daily) or misoprostol (200g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. There is no supplied documentation that places this patient at intermediate or severe gastrointestinal risk that would require a use of a PPI with NSAID therapy. The documentation states the patient has GI side effects from the medications but criteria for PPI have not been met versus simple OTC H2 blocker. For these reasons the criteria as set forth above have not been met for the use of the medication. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

