

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0213850		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/31/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/03/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/03/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	12/12/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/22/2014

### 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. 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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

### 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 45-year-old female, with a reported date of injury of 06/03/2013. The diagnoses include lateral epicondylitis, impingement syndrome, and knee sprain/strain. Treatments have included oral medications. The progress report dated 11/05/2014 was handwritten and partially illegible. The report did not indicate that there were any gastrointestinal issues, concerns, or diagnosis. On 12/12/2014, Utilization Review (UR) denied the request for Pantoprazole 20mg #60, noting that there was no clear evidence of significant risk for gastrointestinal events or of significant gastrointestinal symptoms needing the use of this medication. The MTUS Chronic Pain Guidelines were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Pantoprazole 20mg #60.:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS; GI risk Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDS, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS states "Determine if the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events: (1) age > 65 years; (2) history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation; (3) concurrent use of ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." And "Patients at intermediate risk for gastrointestinal events and no cardiovascular disease : (1) A non-selective NSAID with either a PPI (Proton Pump Inhibitor, for example, 20 mg omeprazole daily) or misoprostol (200g four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. Long-term PPI use (> 1 year) has been shown to increase the risk of hip fracture (adjusted odds ratio 1.44)." ODG states if a PPI is used, omeprazole OTC tablets or lansoprazole 24HR OTC are recommended for an equivalent clinical efficacy and significant cost savings. Products in this drug class have demonstrated equivalent clinical efficacy and safety at comparable doses, including esomeprazole (Nexium), lansoprazole (Prevacid), omeprazole (Prilosec), pantoprazole (Protonix), dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and rabeprazole (Aciphex). (Shi, 2008) A trial of omeprazole or lansoprazole is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)The medical documents provided do not establish the patient has having documented GI bleeding/perforation/peptic ulcer or other GI risk factors as outlined in MTUS. Additionally, there is no evidence provided to indicate the patient suffers from dyspepsia because of the present medication regimen. As such, the request for Pantoprazole is not medically necessary.