

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0167334		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	09/08/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/26/2001
<b>Decision Date:</b>	10/07/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/28/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/25/2015

### 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:

This is a 45 year old male with a date of injury on 04-26-2001. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for lumbago, sciatica, and lumbar, thoracic radiculitis. Medical records (07-09-2015) indicate ongoing back pain rated at 7 out of 10 with medication. Treatment to date consisted of diagnostic testing, prescribed medications and periodic follow up visits. Per the treating physician's report dated 07-09-2015, the injured worker presented for medication reassessment. The treating physician indicated that the injured worker was stable on current medication with no side effects. The treating physician also indicated that the injured worker did not exhibit any aberrant behavior. The physical exam revealed no acute distress. Musculoskeletal exam for date of service (07-09-2015) was not included for review. Treatment plan consisted of medication management. The treating physician prescribed services for retrospective Soma 350 mg #90 ( start date 07-09-2015 and end 08-07-2015), now under review.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Retro Soma 350 mg #90 (start date 7/9/2015 and end 8/7/2015): Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids.

**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.