MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM15-0126750		
Date Assigned:	07/13/2015	Date of Injury:	03/04/2015
Decision Date:	08/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/30/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii
Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 injured worker is a 36-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 03/04/15. Initial complaints include pain in the right shoulder and neck and headaches. Initial diagnoses include right shoulder strain. Treatments to date include medications. Diagnostic studies include a MRI of the cervical spine on 05/12/15. Current complaints include headaches and neck pain. Current diagnoses include cervicalgia, muscle spasms, spasms of the shoulder and neck, and spasms and strain of the shoulder and upper arm. In a progress note dated 06/11/15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as physical therapy, trigger point injections on the date of service, and medications including Ultracet, Voltaren, and Norflex. The requested treatments include Voltaren and Norflex.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Voltaren ER 100mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) Page(s): 67-73. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

Decision rationale: MTUS specifies four recommendations regarding NSAID use: 1) Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. 2) Back Pain; Acute exacerbations of chronic pain: Recommended as a second-line treatment after acetaminophen. In general, there is conflicting evidence that NSAIDs are more effective that acetaminophen for acute LBP. 3) Back Pain; Chronic low back pain: Recommended as an option for short-term symptomatic relief. A Cochrane review of the literature on drug relief for low back pain (LBP) suggested that NSAIDs were no more effective than other drugs such as acetaminophen, narcotic analgesics, and muscle relaxants. The review also found that NSAIDs had more adverse effects than placebo and acetaminophen but fewer effects than muscle relaxants and narcotic analgesics. 4) Neuropathic pain: There is inconsistent evidence for the use of these medications to treat long-term neuropathic pain, but they may be useful to treat breakthrough and mixed pain conditions such as osteoarthritis (and other nociceptive pain) in with neuropathic pain. The medical documents do not indicate that the patient is being treated for osteoarthritis. Additionally, the treating physician does not document failure of primary (Tylenol) treatment. Progress notes do not indicate how long the patient has been on Voltaren, but the MTUS guidelines recommend against long-term use. The treating physician has not provided documentation of objective functional improvement with the use of this medication. As such, the request for Voltaren ER 100mg #30 is not medically necessary.

Norflex ER 150mg #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: Norflex is classified as a muscle relaxant. MTUS 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. 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. ODG recommends limited muscle relaxant usage to 2 weeks in duration. Additionally, MTUS states Orphenadrine (Norflex, Banflex, Antiflex, Mio-Rel, Orphenate, generic available): This drug is similar to diphenhydramine, but has greater anticholinergic effects. The mode of action is not clearly understood. Effects are thought to be secondary to analgesic and anticholinergic properties. This drug was approved by the FDA in 1959. Side Effects: Anticholinergic effects (drowsiness, urinary retention, dry mouth). Side effects may limit use in the elderly. This medication has been reported in case studies to be abused for euphoria and to have mood elevating effects. (Shariatmadari, 1975) Dosing: 100 mg twice a day; combination products are given three to four times a day. (See, 2008) MTUS guidelines recommend against the long term use of muscle relaxants. The patient has been on this muscle relaxant in excess of guideline recommendations of a two week limit. The medical documents do not indicate extenuating circumstances to allow for exceptions to the guidelines. As such, the request for Norflex ER 150mg #60 is not medically necessary.