

Case Number:	CM15-0132722		
Date Assigned:	07/20/2015	Date of Injury:	02/22/2010
Decision Date:	08/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/22/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/09/2015

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 47 year old male with an industrial injury dated 02/22/2010. The injured worker's diagnoses include cervical disc disease, status post lumbar spinal fusion and removal of hardware, and hypertension. Treatment consisted of diagnostic studies, prescribed medications, and periodic follow up visits. In a progress note dated 04/10/2015, the injured worker reported continue complaints of neck pain, spasms and stiffness that radiates down the left arm. The injured worker also complained of tingling sensation in the low back. The injured worker rated pain a 9-10/10 in severity. Objective findings revealed muscle spasm in his low back, some neck pain and stiffness radiating to his left arm. The treating physician reported that the injured worker ambulates with a cane for security and has normal strength, sensation and reflexes in the upper and lower extremities. The treatment plan consisted of medication management. The treating physician prescribed Carisoprodol 350mg #90 now under review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Carisoprodol 350mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle relaxants. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines.

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 medically necessary.