

Case Number:	CM15-0114541		
Date Assigned:	06/22/2015	Date of Injury:	11/09/2010
Decision Date:	07/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/15/2015

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 47 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 11/9/10. She has reported initial complaints of neck and left wrist injury. The diagnoses have included cervical degenerative disc disease (DDD), and cervical disc displacement without myelopathy. Treatment to date has included medications, activity modifications, diagnostics, surgery, physical therapy and other modalities. Currently, as per the physician progress note dated 5/5/15, the injured worker complains of chronic neck pain with radiation into the left upper extremity, with associated numbness and tingling and headaches. She reports headaches, blurred vision, neck pain, abnormal heart beat and numbness. The objective findings reveal that the exam of the neck shows decreased range of motion in flexion at 10 degrees, extension at 20 degrees, and rotation to the left at 60 degrees and to the right at 60 degrees. The diagnostic testing that was performed included Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) of the cervical spine and electromyography (EMG) /nerve conduction velocity studies (NCV) of the left upper extremity. The current medications included Gabapentin, Zanaflex, and Sumatriptan. The physician requested treatment included Zanaflex 4mg #90 for muscle spasms.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Zanaflex 4mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain) Page(s): 64-66.

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 certified. Therefore, the requested treatment is not medically necessary.