

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0109620		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/16/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/18/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/14/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/26/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/05/2015

### 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: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

### 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 49-year-old female, who sustained an industrial injury on February 18, 2011. She reported neck, thoracic spine, abdomen, back, shoulders, upper extremities and lower extremities pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbosacral sprain. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, physical therapy, medications and work restrictions. Currently, the injured worker complains of continued neck, thoracic spine, abdomen, back, shoulders, upper extremities and lower extremities pain. The injured worker reported an industrial injury in 2011, resulting in the above noted pain. She was treated conservatively without complete resolution of the pain. Evaluation on December 23, 2014, revealed continued pain as noted. She reported several previous injuries with similar complaints including an automobile accident that exacerbated her pain symptoms. Prilosec and soma were requested.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Prilosec 20mg 1 twice a day Qty 60:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs Page(s): 68-69.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms and Cardiovascular risk, Pages 68-69.

**Decision rationale:** Prilosec (Omeprazole) medication is for treatment of the problems associated with erosive esophagitis from GERD, or in patients with hypersecretion diseases. Per MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, the patient does not meet criteria for Omeprazole (Prilosec) namely reserved for patients with history of prior GI bleeding, the elderly (over 65 years), diabetics, and chronic cigarette smokers. Submitted reports have not described or provided any GI diagnosis that meets the criteria to indicate medical treatment. Review of the records show no documentation of any history, symptoms, or GI diagnosis to warrant this medication. The Prilosec 20mg 1 twice a day Qty 60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Soma 350mg; unspecified Qty:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol (Soma) Page(s): 29.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Carisoprodol (Soma), page 29.

**Decision rationale:** Per MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines on muscle relaxant, Soma is not recommended for mild to moderate chronic persistent pain problems including chronic pain (other than for acute exacerbations) due to the high prevalence of adverse effects in the context of insufficient evidence of benefit as compared to other medications. Guidelines do not recommend long-term use of this muscle relaxant for this chronic injury. Additionally, the efficacy in clinical trials has been inconsistent and most studies are small and of short duration. These medications may be useful for chronic musculoskeletal pain, but there are no long-term studies of their effectiveness or safety. Submitted reports have not adequately demonstrated the indication or medical need for this treatment and there is no report of progressive deterioration in clinical findings, acute flare-up or new injury to support for its long-term use. There is no report of functional improvement resulting from its previous treatment to support further use as the patient remains unchanged. The Soma 350mg; unspecified Qty is not medically necessary and appropriate.