

Case Number:	CM15-0131394		
Date Assigned:	07/20/2015	Date of Injury:	06/12/2003
Decision Date:	08/21/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/29/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/07/2015

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: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 54 year-old male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/12/03. He reported back pain. The injured worker was diagnosed with having lumbar degenerative disc disease/lumbago. Diagnostic testing and treatment to date has included radiographic imaging, epidural steroid injection, physical therapy, chiropractic care, acupuncture, and pain medication management. Currently, the injured worker reports he has improved after aqua therapy with no longer needing the use of two canes to ambulate. He is status post failed back surgery. Additional notation includes the injured worker has suffered an exasperation of his injury. His medication allows him to participate in aqua therapy. Requested treatments include Soma 350mg #45, and gym membership for 1 year. Date of Utilization Review: 06/29/15.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Soma 350mg #45: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisprodol (Soma).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines muscle relaxants Page(s): 63-65.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on muscle relaxants states: Recommend non-sedating muscle relaxants with caution as a second-line option for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations in patients with chronic LBP. (Chou, 2007) (Mens, 2005) (Van Tulder, 1998) (van Tulder, 2003) (van Tulder, 2006) (Schnitzer, 2004) (See, 2008) Muscle relaxants may be effective in reducing pain and muscle tension, and increasing mobility. However, in most LBP cases, they show no benefit beyond NSAIDs in pain and overall improvement. Also there is no additional benefit shown in combination with NSAIDs. Efficacy appears to diminish over time, and prolonged use of some medications in this class may lead to dependence. (Homik, 2004) (Chou, 2004) This medication is not intended for long-term use per the California MTUS. The medication has not been prescribed for the flare-up of chronic low back pain. This is not an approved use for the medication. For these reasons, criteria for the use of this medication have not been met. Therefore the request is not certified.

Gym membership for 1 year: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Aquatic therapy.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) gym membership.

Decision rationale: The California MTUS and the ACOEM do not specifically address gym memberships. Per the Official Disability Guidelines, gym memberships are not recommended as a medical prescription unless a documented home exercise program with periodic assessment and revision has not been effective and there is a need for specialized equipment not available at home. Treatment needs to be monitored and administered by medical professionals. There is no included documentation, which shows failure of home exercise program. The criteria for gym membership as outlined above have not been met. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.