

Case Number:	CM14-0026323		
Date Assigned:	06/13/2014	Date of Injury:	01/10/2013
Decision Date:	11/24/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/18/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/03/2014

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 Family 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:

The patient is a 34 year-old man who was injured at work on 1/10/2013. The injury was primarily to his shoulder. He is requesting review of denial for the following: Carisoprodol 350mg #60 and Hydrocodone/Ibuprofen 7.5/200mg # 60. The medical records corroborate ongoing care for his injuries. The patient had an evaluation that included radiographs in 2013 demonstrating a right shoulder labral tear. This was treated with surgical repair. The records suggest that he underwent post-operative physical therapy. He has been on a variety of medications to include NSAIDs, Opioids, and Proton Pump Inhibitors. In an office visit with a specialist in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation on 1/7/2014 he was advised to continue the use of the above listed medications. A follow-up visit on 1/29/2014 indicated that that the patient still had mild loss of range of motion and he was advised to continue the current regimen and await a QME for a Final Rating.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Carisoprodol 350 mg, QTY: 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol Page(s): 29.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol Page(s): 29.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines list carisoprodol (also known as Soma) as being "not recommended." This medication is not indicated for long-term use. Carisoprodol is a commonly prescribed, centrally acting skeletal muscle relaxant whose primary active metabolite is meprobamate (a schedule-IV controlled substance). Carisoprodol is now scheduled in several states but not on a federal level. It has been suggested that the main effect is due to generalized sedation and treatment of anxiety. Abuse has been noted for sedative and relaxant effects. In regular abusers the main concern is the accumulation of meprobamate. Carisoprodol abuse has also been noted in order to augment or alter effects of other drugs. This includes the following: (1) increasing sedation of benzodiazepines or alcohol; (2) use to prevent side effects of cocaine; (3) use with tramadol to produce relaxation and euphoria; (4) as a combination with hydrocodone, an effect that some abusers claim is similar to heroin (referred to as a "Las Vegas Cocktail"); & (5) as a combination with codeine (referred to as Soma Coma (Reeves, 1999) (Reeves, 2001) (Reeves, 2008) (Schears, 2004) There was a 300% increase in numbers of emergency room episodes related to carisoprodol from 1994 to 2005. (DHSS, 2005) Intoxication appears to include subdued consciousness, decreased cognitive function, and abnormalities of the eyes, vestibular function, appearance, gait and motor function. Intoxication includes the effects of both carisoprodol and meprobamate, both of which act on different neurotransmitters. (Bramness, 2007) (Bramness, 2004) A withdrawal syndrome has been documented that consists of insomnia, vomiting, tremors, muscle twitching, anxiety, and ataxia when abrupt discontinuation of large doses occurs. Given the non-recommended status of carisoprodol and the accompanying use of an opioid, carisoprodol is not considered as a medically necessary treatment for this patient.

Hydrocodone Bit-Ibuprofen 7.5-200 mg, QTY: 60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 91.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 76-78, 80.

Decision rationale: The MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines comment on the long-term use of opioids. These guidelines have established criteria on the use of opioids for the ongoing management of pain. Actions should include: prescriptions from a single practitioner and from a single pharmacy. The lowest possible dose should be prescribed to improve pain and function. There should be an ongoing review and documentation of pain relief, functional status, appropriate medication use and side effects. Pain assessment should include: current pain, the least reported pain over the period since last assessment; average pain; intensity of pain after taking the opioid; how long it takes for pain relief; and how long pain relief lasts. Satisfactory response to treatment may be indicated by the patient's decreased pain, increased level of function, or improved quality of life. There should be evidence of documentation of the "4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring." These four domains include: pain relief, side effects, physical and psychological functioning, and the occurrence of any potentially aberrant drug-related behaviors. Further, there should be consideration of a consultation with a multidisciplinary pain clinic if doses of opioids are required beyond what is usually required for the condition or pain

that does not improve on opioids in 3 months. There should be consideration of an addiction medicine consult if there is evidence of substance misuse (Pages 76-78). Finally, the guidelines indicate that for chronic back pain, the long-term efficacy of opioids is unclear. Failure to respond to a time-limited course of opioids has led to the suggestion of reassessment and consideration of alternative therapy (Page 80). Based on the review of the medical records, there is insufficient documentation in support of these stated MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines for the ongoing use of opioids. There is insufficient documentation of the "4 A's for Ongoing Monitoring." The treatment course of opioids in this patient has extended well beyond the timeframe required for a reassessment of therapy. In summary, there is insufficient documentation to support the chronic use of an opioid in this patient. Treatment with Hydrocodone/Ibuprofen is not considered as medically necessary.