

Case Number:	CM13-0068916		
Date Assigned:	01/03/2014	Date of Injury:	06/01/2000
Decision Date:	05/23/2014	UR Denial Date:	12/13/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/20/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Preventive Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 45-year-old male with a 6/1/00 date of injury. At the time (12/13/13) of the Decision for 270 tablets of Carisoprodol 350mg, there is documentation of subjective (chronic pain in the neck, low back, and knees) and objective (decreased cervical range of motion, tenderness to palpation and spasm in the upper trapezius and levator scapulae musculature bilaterally; decreased lumbar range of motion with tenderness and spasm in the lumbar paraspinal musculature; and decreased range of motion of the knees with positive McMurray's test and crepitus with motion on the right) findings, current diagnoses (cervical spine sprain/strain, lumbar spine sprain/strain, and knee sprain/strain), and treatment to date (Carisoprodol since at least 1/2/13). There is no documentation of acute exacerbation of chronic low back pain; short-term (less than two weeks) treatment; and functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of use of Carisoprodol.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

270 TABLETS OF CARISOPRODOL 350MG: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines LOW BACK COMPLAINTS..

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants (For Pain), Page(s): 63-64. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Muscle relaxants (for pain).

Decision rationale: MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines identifies documentation of acute exacerbation of chronic low back pain and used as a second line option for short-term treatment, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of muscle relaxants. MTUS-Definitions identifies that any treatment intervention should not be continued in the absence of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications or medical services. ODG identifies that muscle relaxants are recommended for short-term (less than two weeks) treatment. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of cervical spine sprain/strain, lumbar spine sprain/strain, and knee sprain/strain. In addition, there is documentation of chronic low back pain with spasms. However, there is no documentation of acute exacerbation of chronic low back pain. In addition, given documentation of ongoing treatment with Carisoprodol since at least 1/2/13, there is no documentation of short-term (less than two weeks) treatment. Furthermore, there is documentation of functional benefit or improvement as a reduction in work restrictions; an increase in activity tolerance; and/or a reduction in the use of medications as a result of use of Carisoprodol. Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for 270 tablets of Carisoprodol 350mg is not medically necessary.