

Case Number:	CM15-0043587		
Date Assigned:	03/13/2015	Date of Injury:	07/08/2002
Decision Date:	04/23/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/17/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/09/2015

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 an approximately 57-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 07/08/2002. She reported that after lifting something heavy during work she began to experience pain to the right paracervical region and right shoulder. The injured worker was diagnosed as having cervical degenerative disc disease, cervical spondylosis without myelopathy, neck pain, and cervical radiculopathy. Treatment to date has included medication regimen, epidural steroid injections, acupuncture, local injections, and chiropractic sessions. In a progress note dated 02/28/2014 the treating provider reports increased pain to the neck and trapezius. The treating physician also noted tenderness and tightness to the paraspinal muscles of the neck, trapezius, and scapular areas. The documentation provided did not contain the recent request for the medication Carisoprodol (Soma), but the documentation from 04/27/2012 noted previous use of this medication.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Carisoprodol 350 mg Qty 30 with 3 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol (Soma) Page(s): 29. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines: Pain Procedure Summary.

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.