

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0101257		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/12/2000
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/26/2015

### 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 46 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 07/12/00. Initial complaints and diagnoses are not available. Treatments to date include multiple consultations, chiropractic therapy, and medications. Diagnostic studies include multiple x-rays, electrodiagnostic and nerve conduction studies. Current complaints include pain in the neck radiation to the bilateral upper extremities, and bilateral leg pain radiating to the lumbar spine. Current diagnoses include cervical and lumbar spine multilevel bulges, osteoarthritis of the left hip, thoracic sprain, and thoracic spine bulges T8-9. In a progress note dated 04/17/15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as medications including TGIce, Fluribiprofen, Soma, and Norco. The requested treatments include Soma and Norco. The injured worker has been on Soma and Norco since at least 02/27/14.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325mg #120:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Detoxification, Criteria for use of Opioids, On-going management Page(s): 42, 78.

**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 Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen), 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), no documentation regarding side effects, 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 Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.

**Soma 350mg #90:** Upheld

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

**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 carisoprodol (Soma), 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 Soma specifically is not recommended for more than 2 to 3 weeks. Within the documentation available for review, there is no identification of a specific analgesic benefit or objective functional improvement as a result of the carisoprodol. 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 carisoprodol (Soma) is not medically necessary.