

Case Number:	CM14-0083174		
Date Assigned:	07/21/2014	Date of Injury:	11/09/1998
Decision Date:	09/22/2014	UR Denial Date:	05/15/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	06/04/2014

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. 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/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

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 patient is a 56-year-old male who has submitted a claim for reflux secondary to Norco use associated with an industrial injury date of November 9, 1998. Medical records from 2013 were reviewed, which showed that the patient was assessed with cervical pain, lumbosacral pain, insomnia and reflux secondary to Norco (acetaminophen and hydrocodone) use. The latest progress note mentioned that the patient came in for refills as his Prevacid (pantoprazole) for his reflux had ran out. Accordingly, there were no changes in his condition for the past month. There was no examination of the abdomen provided in the recent progress notes. Treatment to date has included Prevacid (pantoprazole). Utilization review from May 15, 2014 denied the request for Cytotec 100 mg # 120 for lack of indication. The patient was already on Prevacid and the reason for addition of Cytotec was unclear.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Cytotec 100 mg # 120: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Physician Desk Reference (PDR) 2014.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Food and Drug Administration, Cytotec.

Decision rationale: According to FDA, Cytotec (misoprostol) is indicated for reducing the risk of NSAID (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, including aspirin)-induced gastric ulcers in patients at high risk of complications from gastric ulcer, e.g., the elderly and patients with concomitant debilitating disease, as well as patients at high risk of developing gastric ulceration, such as patients with a history of ulcer. In this case, the patient was prescribed with Cytotec because he was also on Norco, a medication that contains acetaminophen. Acetaminophen is not an NSAID. Furthermore, the patient does not have any GI risk factor such as age > 65 years, history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, or anticoagulant; or on high-dose/multiple NSAIDs. Moreover, the patient was already on pantoprazole, which according to the MTUS guidelines, is a medication that may be used for patients taking an NSAID and who is at an intermediate risk for developing gastrointestinal complications. Therefore, the request for Cytotec 100mg #120 is not medically necessary.