

Case Number:	CM14-0057581		
Date Assigned:	07/09/2014	Date of Injury:	05/26/2010
Decision Date:	06/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/25/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/28/2014

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. 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

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 55-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 5/26/2010. His diagnoses, and/or impressions, are noted to include Grade II anterolisthesis of lumbosacral, secondary to lumbar pars defect; multi-level lumbar/lumbosacral spondylolisthesis; right-sided lumbar radiculopathy; chronic myofascial pain syndrome; and failed back surgery syndrome. No current imaging studies or x-rays are noted. His treatments have included surgery; diagnostic laboratories; a home exercise program; spine stabilization; and medication management. Progress notes of 4/16/2014 reported complaints of escalation of his low back pain that shoots down his legs, right > left, with tingling/numbness and paresthesia; regularly crying in bed; keeping a monthly pain diary; and that his life is miserable. Objective findings were noted to include an increased lumbar lordosis with tenderness, severely restricted range-of-motion, and para-vertebral muscle spasms. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include continuing Flexeril for muscle spasms, and Xanax for anxiety.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 prescription of Flexeril 7.5mg #60: 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): 63-65.

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) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

1 prescription of Xanax 0.5mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines benzodiazepines Page(s): 22.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on benzodiazepines states: Benzodiazepines - Not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Their range of action includes sedative/hypnotic, anxiolytic, anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant. 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. (Baillargeon, 2003) (Ashton, 2005). The chronic long-term use of this class of medication is recommended in very few conditions per the California MTUS. There is no evidence however of failure of first line agent for the treatment of anxiety in the provided documentation. For this reason, the request is not medically necessary.