

Case Number:	CM15-0018433		
Date Assigned:	02/06/2015	Date of Injury:	03/14/1996
Decision Date:	03/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	01/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/30/2015

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: Massachusetts

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 70 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/14/1996. The diagnoses have included failed back surgery syndrome status post T9-S1 fusion and chronic pain syndrome. Noted treatments to date have included surgery and medications. Diagnostics to date have included CT Myelogram of the lumbar spine on 05/30/2013 which showed no neurologic impingement with a solid fusion from T9-S1 with a slight ligamentum flavum enfolding at T8-9. In a progress note dated 12/16/2014, the injured worker presented with complaints of back and lower limb pain. The treating physician reported refilling her medications and noted the Methocarbamol is to be taken one daily as needed for pain and spasm. Utilization Review determination on 01/14/2015 non-certified the request for Methocarbamol (Robaxin) 500mg #30 citing Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule Guidelines.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Methocarbamol (Robaxin) 500mg #30: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Muscle Relaxants Page(s): 63.

Decision rationale: The MTUS, Recommends 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) (VanTulder, 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. Sedation is the most commonly reported adverse effect of muscle relaxant medications. These drugs should be used with caution in patients driving motor vehicles or operating heavy machinery. Drugs with the most limited published evidence in terms of clinical effectiveness include chlorzoxazone, methocarbamol, dantrolene and baclofen. (Chou, 2004) According to a recent review in American Family Physician, skeletal muscle relaxants are the most widely prescribed drug class for musculoskeletal conditions (18.5% of prescriptions), and the most commonly prescribed antispasmodic agents are carisoprodol, cyclobenzaprine, metaxalone, and methocarbamol, but despite their popularity, skeletal muscle relaxants should not be the primary drug class of choice for musculoskeletal conditions. (See2, 2008) According to the documents available for review, the patient has been utilizing Robaxin for long-term treatment of chronic pain condition. This is in contrast to the MTUS recommendations for short-term treatment of acute exacerbations. Therefore, at this time, the requirements for treatment have not been met and medical necessity has not been established.