

Case Number:	CM15-0068427		
Date Assigned:	05/14/2015	Date of Injury:	07/14/2008
Decision Date:	06/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/27/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/10/2015

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: 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 (IW) is a 48-year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 07/14/2008 due to a motor vehicle accident. Diagnoses include degenerative disc disease of the lumbar spine. Treatments to date include medications, bracing, physical therapy and epidural steroid injections. MRIs, x-rays and electrodiagnostic testing were performed. According to the progress notes dated 3/5/15, the Injured Worker reported neck and low back pain with left leg pain and numbness. He was using Tramadol for moderate pain and Norco for breakthrough pain; the Methoderm patches were not helpful. A request was made for Flexeril 7.5mg, #60 and one lumbosacral orthosis. The provider stated a request would be made for a pain management specialist to manage the medications due to the Injured Worker's deferral of authorized spinal surgery; the orthosis was requested by the Injured Worker.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 prescription of Flexeril 7.5mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Flexeril (Cyclobenzaprine).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Cyclobenzaprine, Medications for chronic pain, Antispasmodics Page(s): 41-42, 60-61, 64-66. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) and Other Medical Treatment Guidelines UpToDate, Flexeril.

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment states for Cyclobenzaprine, "Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy. . . The effect is greatest in the first 4 days of treatment, suggesting that shorter courses may be better. (Browning, 2001) Treatment should be brief." The medical documents indicate that patient is far in excess of the initial treatment window and period. Additionally, MTUS outlines that "Relief of pain with the use of medications is generally temporary, and measures of the lasting benefit from this modality should include evaluating the effect of pain relief in relationship to improvements in function and increased activity. Before prescribing any medication for pain the following should occur: (1) determine the aim of use of the medication; (2) determine the potential benefits and adverse effects; (3) determine the patient's preference. Only one medication should be given at a time, and interventions that are active and passive should remain unchanged at the time of the medication change. A trial should be given for each individual medication. Analgesic medications should show effects within 1 to 3 days, and the analgesic effect of antidepressants should occur within 1 week. A record of pain and function with the medication should be recorded." (Mens, 2005) Uptodate "flexeril" also recommends "Do not use longer than 2-3 weeks". Medical documents do not fully detail the components outlined in the guidelines above and do not establish the need for long term/chronic usage of cyclobenzaprine. ODG states regarding cyclobenzaprine, "Recommended as an option, using a short course of therapy . . . The addition of cyclobenzaprine to other agents is not recommended". The treating physician has not provided documentation of objective or subjective complaints of spasms. As such, the request for 1 prescription of Flexeril 7.5mg #60 is not medically necessary.

1 lumbo sacral orthosis: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 298, 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back - Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 301. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Low Back (Lumbar and Thoracic), Lumbar Support.

Decision rationale: ACOEM states, "Lumbar supports have not been shown to have any lasting benefit beyond the acute phase of symptom relief". ODG states, "Not recommended for prevention, recommended as an option for treatment. See below for indications. Prevention: Not recommended for prevention. There is strong and consistent evidence that lumbar supports were not effective in preventing neck and back pain. (Jellema-Cochrane, 2001) (Van Poppel, 1997) (Linton, 2001) (Assendelft-Cochrane, 2004) (Van Poppel, 2004) (Resnick, 2005) Lumbar supports do not prevent LBP. (Kinkade, 2007) A systematic review on preventing episodes of back problems found strong, consistent evidence that exercise interventions are effective and

other interventions not effective, including stress management, shoe inserts, back supports, ergonomic/back education, and reduced lifting programs. (Bigos, 2009) This systematic review concluded that there is moderate evidence that lumbar supports are no more effective than doing nothing in preventing low-back pain. (Van Duijvenbode, 2008)" ODG states for use as a treatment "Treatment: Recommended as an option for compression fractures and specific treatment of spondylolisthesis, documented instability, and for treatment of nonspecific LBP (very low-quality evidence, but may be a conservative option)". The patient is beyond the acute phase of treatment and the treating physician has provided no documentation of spondylolisthesis or documented instability. As such the request for 1 lumbo sacral orthosis is not medically necessary.