

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0099552		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/02/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	11/20/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/03/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/24/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/22/2015

### 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:

This 58 year old 58 sustained an industrial injury on 11/20/2012. The mechanism of injury is not detailed. Diagnoses include cervical spondylosis without myelopathy, brachial plexus lesions, carpal tunnel syndrome, and lesion of nerve. Treatment has included oral and topical medications. Physician notes dated 2/27/2015 show complaints of persistent right arm and leg numbness and residual low back, neck, with crepitus noted in the shoulder. Recommendations include psychiatry consultation, chiropractic treatment, Lidoderm, Robaxin, BioFreeze gel, Topamax, Tylenol, Zoloft, Ativan, supervised aquatic therapy, baby Aspirin, continued independent exercise, and follow up once the above is authorized.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Lidoderm patch 5%, #30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Lidoderm (lidocaine patch); Topical Analgesics.

**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): 112 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding request for topical lidoderm, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of topical lidocaine for localized peripheral pain after there has been evidence of a trial of the 1st line therapy such as tri-cyclic antidepressants, SNRIs, or antiepileptic drugs. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has failed first-line therapy recommendations. Additionally, there is no documentation of objective functional improvement as a result of the currently prescribed lidoderm. Finally, there is no documentation of localized peripheral pain as recommended by guidelines. As such, the currently requested lidoderm is not medically necessary.

**Robaxin 500mg, #30 with 2 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants (for pain).

**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 methocarbamol (Robaxin), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines support the use of nonsedating muscle relaxants to be used with caution as a 2nd line option for the short-term treatment of acute exacerbations of pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the methocarbamol. 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 methocarbamol (Robaxin) is not medically necessary.

**Ativan 0.5mg, #30:** Upheld

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

**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): 24 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Chronic Pain Chapter, Benzodiazepines.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Ativan (lorazepam), Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state the benzodiazepines are not recommended for long-term use because long-term efficacy is unproven and there is a risk of dependence. Most guidelines limit use to 4 weeks. Tolerance to anxiolytic effects occurs within months and long-term use may actually increase anxiety. A more appropriate treatment for anxiety disorder is an antidepressant. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation identifying any objective functional improvement as a result of the use of the medication and no rationale provided for long-term use of the medication despite the CA MTUS recommendation against long-term use. Benzodiazepines should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to

modify the current request to allow tapering. In the absence of such documentation, the currently requested Ativan (lorazepam) is not medically necessary.

**Aquatic therapy, 6 sessions:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic therapy; Functional improvement.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 12 Low Back Complaints Page(s): 298, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 22, 98-99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low Back Chapter, Physical Therapy.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for aquatic therapy, Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines state that aquatic therapy is recommended as an optional form of exercise therapy where available as an alternative to land-based physical therapy. They go on to state that it is specifically recommended whenever reduced weight bearing is desirable, for example extreme obesity. Guidelines go on to state that for the recommendation on the number of supervised visits, see physical therapy guidelines. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation indicating why the patient would require therapy in a reduced weight-bearing environment. Furthermore, there is no indication as to how many physical/aquatic therapy sessions the patient has undergone and what specific objective functional improvement has been obtained with the therapy sessions already provided. Finally, there is no statement indicating whether the patient is performing a home exercise program on a regular basis, and whether or not that home exercise program has been modified if it has been determined to be ineffective. In the absence of clarity regarding those issues, the currently requested aquatic therapy is not medically necessary.