

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0072222		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/22/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/19/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/20/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/28/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/15/2015

### 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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 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:

The injured worker is a 55 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on November 19, 2013. She has reported lower back pain, and leg pain with numbness and tingling. Diagnoses have included chronic lower back pain, multilevel disc herniations with degenerative disc disease, and bilateral lower extremity radiculitis. Treatment to date has included medications, epidural steroid injection, physical therapy, home exercise, and imaging studies. A progress note dated February 17, 2015 indicates a chief complaint of lower back pain that improved following the epidural steroid injection. The treating physician documented a plan of care that included medications.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Cyclobenzaprine 7.5mg # 30:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 63-66 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of non-sedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Guidelines go on to state that cyclobenzaprine specifically is recommended for a short course of therapy. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the cyclobenzaprine. Additionally, it does not appear that this medication is being prescribed for the short-term treatment of an acute exacerbation, as recommended by guidelines. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested cyclobenzaprine (Flexeril) is not medically necessary.