

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0096635		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	05/27/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/05/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/25/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/11/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/19/2015

### 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 44 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 02/05/2013. The injured worker is currently permanent and stationary. The injured worker is currently diagnosed as having L5-S1 herniated nucleus pulposus, annular tear, and far lateral nerve entrapment at left L5. Treatment and diagnostics to date has included lumbar spine MRI shows lumbar degenerative disc changes at L5-S1 with an annular tear and bulge and medications. In a progress note dated 04/27/2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of back pain that radiates to her left buttock and constantly down her left leg. Objective findings include lumbosacral tenderness with decreased range of motion. The treating physician reported requesting authorization for remaining chiropractic treatment, Flexeril, and Tylenol #3.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Chiropractic x 12 sessions:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Manual Therapy and Manipulation.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines x 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 58-60 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for chiropractic care, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of chiropractic care for the treatment of chronic pain caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Guidelines go on to recommend a trial of up to 6 visits over 2 weeks for the treatment of low back pain. With evidence of objective functional improvement, a total of up to 18 visits over 6 to 8 weeks may be supported. Within the documentation available for review, there is documentation of completion of prior chiropractic sessions with unspecified benefit noted, but there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the previous sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program, yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. In the absence of clarity regarding the above issues, the currently requested chiropractic care is not medically necessary.

**Flexeril:** Upheld

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

**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.

**Tylenol No 3:** Upheld

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

**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): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Tylenol #3, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that this is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the

documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS) and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Tylenol #3 is not medically necessary.