

Case Number:	CM14-0026610		
Date Assigned:	06/13/2014	Date of Injury:	03/28/1991
Decision Date:	07/21/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/11/2014
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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, has a subspecialty in Pain Management 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:

This is a male patient with the date of injury of March 28, 1991. No relevant medical reports were included in the documentation available for review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

RETROSPECTIVE VARDENAFIL 20MG #24 DOS: 1/7/14: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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): 110-111. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: J Adv Pharm Technol Res. 2010 Jul-Sep; 1(3): 297-301, <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/druginfo/meds/a603035.html>.

Decision rationale: Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: J Adv Pharm Technol Res. 2010 Jul-Sep; 1(3): 297-301, <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/druginfo/meds/a603035.html>

METHOCARBAMOL 750MG #90 DOS: 1/7/2014: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for methocarbamol, 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. Within the documentation available for review, there are no medical reports available identifying that methocarbamol 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 is not medically necessary.