

Case Number:	CM15-0127646		
Date Assigned:	07/14/2015	Date of Injury:	09/10/2014
Decision Date:	08/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/05/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/01/2015

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: California, District of Columbia, Maryland
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

This 40-year-old female sustained an industrial injury to the head on 9/10/14. The injured worker was diagnosed with a closed head injury and concussion without loss of consciousness. Computed tomography head was normal. Previous treatment included chiropractic therapy and medications. In a PR-2 dated 5/28/15, the injured worker complained of neck and upper back pain with radiation to the left arm associated with numbness and tingling of the hands as well as almost daily headaches. Current diagnoses included post-concussion syndrome, myofascial pain, chronic pain syndrome, De Quervain's tenosynovitis, medial epicondylitis and cervical spine radiculopathy. The treatment plan included cervical spine magnetic resonance imaging and medications (Naproxen Sodium and Cyclobenzaprine).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retro Naproxen Sodium 550mg tab BID #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68, 73.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 67-68.

Decision rationale: With regard to the use of NSAIDs for chronic low back pain, the MTUS CPMTG states "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. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another." "Low back pain (chronic): Both acetaminophen and NSAIDs have been recommended as first line therapy for low back pain. There is insufficient evidence to recommend one medication over the other. Selection should be made on a case-by-case basis based on weighing efficacy vs. side effect profile." The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker has been using this medication daily, long term. As it is only recommended for short-term symptomatic relief, the request is not medically necessary.

Retro Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg tab OD #60: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-64.

Decision rationale: With regard to muscle relaxants, the MTUS CPMTG 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." Regarding Cyclobenzaprine: "Recommended for a short course of therapy. Limited, mixed-evidence does not allow for a recommendation for chronic use. Cyclobenzaprine is a skeletal muscle relaxant and a central nervous system depressant with similar effects to tricyclic antidepressants (e.g. amitriptyline). Cyclobenzaprine is more effective than placebo in the management of back pain, although the effect is modest and comes at the price of adverse effects." Per p41 of the MTUS guidelines the effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. UDS that evaluate for cyclobenzaprine can provide additional data on whether the injured worker is compliant, however in this case there is no UDS testing for cyclobenzaprine. The documentation submitted for review indicates that the injured worker has been using this medication long-term. As it is recommended only for short-term use, the request is not medically necessary.