

Case Number:	CM15-0080997		
Date Assigned:	05/01/2015	Date of Injury:	07/29/2006
Decision Date:	06/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	03/30/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	04/27/2015

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: Georgia

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, 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 60 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 7/29/2006. Diagnoses include chronic pain syndrome, knee pain, dysthymic disorder, thoracic back pain, neck pain, lumbar degenerative disc disease, thoracic degenerative disc disease, shoulder pain and muscle pain. Treatment to date has included diagnostics, medications, stretching, ice, heat and injections. Per the Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report dated 3/13/2015, the injured worker reported multiple areas of pain. Her pain is about the same. She reports aching in the neck, upper back, low back, left shoulder and left knee rated as 9/10 without medications and 6/10 with medications. Physical examination revealed an antalgic gait. She ambulates with a cane. There was tenderness to the lumbar paraspinals with limited range of motion upon flexion and extension due to pain. Cervical spine evaluation revealed tenderness in the trapezius, parascapular region and paraspinal muscles. The plan of care included medications and authorization was requested for Soma/Carisoprodol and Norco.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Soma/Carisoprodol 350mg #120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines - Treatment for Workers' Compensation (ODG-TWC) Pain Procedure Summary last updated 01/19/2015.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol Page(s): 26.

Decision rationale: Soma/Carisoprodol tablets 350mg #120 are not medically necessary. Ca MTUS states that Soma is not recommended. This medication is not indicated for long-term use. Carisoprodol is commonly prescribed, centrally acting skeletal muscle relaxant and his primary active metabolite is meprobamate (schedule for controlled substances). Carisoprodol is now scheduled in several states but not on the federal level. Since been suggested that the main affect is due to generalized sedation and treatment of anxiety. Abuse has been noted for sentences and relaxants effects. In regular basis to maintain concern is the cannulation of medical date. Carisoprodol abuse has also been noted in order to augment or alter effects of other drugs. This includes the following: Increasing sedation of benzodiazepines or alcohol; used to prevent side effects of cocaine; use with tramadol to produce relaxation and euphoria; as a combination with hydrocodone, and affected some abusers claim is similar to heroin; the combination with codeine. There was a 300% increase in numbers of emergency room episodes related to Terrace Woodall from 1994 2005. Intoxication appears to include subjective consciousness, decreased cognitive function, and abnormalities of the eyes, vestibular function, appearance, gait and motor function. Intoxication includes the effects of both cars up at all and meprobamate, both of which act on different neurotransmitters. A withdrawal syndrome has been documented that consists of insomnia, vomiting, tremors, muscle twitching, anxiety, and ataxia when abrupt discontinuation of large doses occur. This is similar to withdrawal from meprobamate. There is little research in terms of weaning of high dose carries up at all and there is no standard treatment regimen for patients with known dependence. Most treatment includes treatment for symptomatic complaints of a stroke. Another option is to switch to phenobarbital to prevent withdrawal with subsequent tapering. A maximum dose of phenobarbital is 500 mg per day and the taper is 3 mg per day with a slower taper in an outpatient setting. Tapering should be individualized to reach patient. There was no specific time limit for the prescription of this medication or a weaning protocol; therefore Soma is not medically necessary.

Norco 10/325/mg #180: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids Page(s): 79.

Decision rationale: Norco 10/325mg #180 is not medically necessary. Per MTUS Page 79 of MTUS guidelines states that weaning of opioids are recommended if (a) there are no overall improvement in function, unless there are extenuating circumstances (b) continuing pain with evidence of intolerable adverse effects (c) decrease in functioning (d) resolution of pain (e) if serious non-adherence is occurring (f) the patient requests discontinuing. The claimant's medical

records did not document that there was an overall improvement in function or a return to work with previous opioid therapy. The claimant has long-term use with this medication and there was a lack of improved function with this opioid. In fact the claimant was designated permanent and stationary; therefore the requested medication is not medically necessary. It is more appropriate to wean the claimant of this medication to avoid side effects of withdrawal.