

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0116850		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/25/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	01/14/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/30/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/17/2015

### 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: Texas, New York, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

### 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 applicant is a represented 40-year-old who has filed a claim for chronic neck and low back pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of January 14, 2010. In a Utilization Review report dated May 23, 2015, the claims administrator failed to approve a request for cyclobenzaprine. The claims administrator referenced an RFA form received on May 15, 2015 in its determination. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. On March 20, 2015, the applicant reported ongoing complaints of neck, low back, hip, thigh, wrist, and hand pain. Norco, Flexeril, Prilosec, and fenoprofen were endorsed. The applicant was not currently employed, it was acknowledged. The applicant reported persistent pain complaints associated with performance of activities of daily living as basic as standing and walking. Multiple medications were renewed while the applicant was seemingly kept off of work. The applicant was asked to pursue trigger point injection therapy.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Cyclobenzaprine 7.5 mg, ninety count with no refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 63 - 64, 67 - 68 and 88.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines  
Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) Page(s): 41.

**Decision rationale:** No, the request for cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) was not medically necessary, medically appropriate, or indicated here. As noted on page 41 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, the addition of cyclobenzaprine or Flexeril to other agents is not recommended. Here, however, the applicant was, in fact, using a variety of other agents, including Norco, fenoprofen, etc. Adding cyclobenzaprine or Flexeril to the mix is not recommended. It is further noted that the 90-tablet supply of cyclobenzaprine at issue, in and of itself, represents treatment in excess of the "short course of therapy" for which cyclobenzaprine is recommended, per page 41 of the MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines. Therefore, the request was not medically necessary.