

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0178258		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/18/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/30/1998
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/23/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/10/2015

### 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:

This 56-year-old female sustained an industrial injury on 4-30-98. Documentation indicated that the injured worker was receiving treatment for left shoulder impingement syndrome, biceps tendonitis, acromial arthropathy, cervical spine radiculopathy, left elbow ulnar neuropathy and bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome. Previous treatment included injections, left extensor carpi radialis brevis debridement, bilateral carpal tunnel release and medications. In a progress note dated 1-30-15, the physician stated that the injured worker was doing reasonably well. The injection was still helping. The injured worker was given a refill of Motrin. In a progress note dated 3-4-15, the physician stated that the injured worker still had intermittent left elbow and neck flares that improved with Motrin. The injured worker was continued on Motrin. In a progress note dated 5-6-15, the physician stated that the injured worker was stable at this point. The injured worker took Motrin as needed. In a progress note dated 8-10-15, the injured worker complained of parascapular muscle tightness. The injured worker was instructed in mobilization exercises. The physician stated that he was going to add Cyclobenzaprine to her medication to minimize tolerance issues and help normalize her sleep pattern. Objective findings were not documented in any progress notes. On 8-10-15 a request for authorization was submitted for Cyclobenzaprine and Motrin. On 8-26-15, Utilization Review non-certified a request for Motrin 800mg TID #100 and Flexeril 10mg HS #30.

## IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Motrin 800mg, 1 TID, #100:** Overturned

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy states: Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxen being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. 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. In addition, evidence from the review suggested that no one NSAID, including COX-2 inhibitors, was clearly more effective than another. 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. This medication is recommended for the shortest period of time and at the lowest dose possible. The dosing of this medication is within the California MTUS guideline recommendations. The definition of shortest period possible is not clearly defined in the California MTUS. Therefore, the request is medically necessary.

**Flexeril 10mg, 1 HS, #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Muscle relaxants (for pain).

**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. 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. 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 but rather ongoing shoulder and neck 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.