

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0095341		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/25/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/13/2003
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/17/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	06/23/2014

### 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 Anesthesia, has a subspecialty in Pain Medicine and Acupuncture 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:

This is a 47 year old male injured worker with date of injury 8/13/03 with related back pain. Per progress report dated 9/3/14, the injured worker reported continued 30-40% pain relief with the use of his Oxycontin. He stated he had the ability to continue to walk 15-20 minutes daily and run errands with the use of his pain medication. He denied any adverse side effects, health changes, or life altering events. He was refractory to ESI (epidural steroid injection) and other injections for his RSD. The documentation submitted for review did not state whether physical therapy was utilized. Treatment to date has included injections, and medication management. The date of UR decision was 6/17/14.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Omeprazole 20mg, #90 with 5 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Page(s): 68, 69, 78.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68.

**Decision rationale:** In the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy, the MTUS recommends stopping the NSAID, switching to a different NSAID, or considering the use of an

H2-receptor antagonist or a PPI. The MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend the use of proton pump inhibitors in conjunction with NSAIDs in situations in which the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events including: (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). Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines further specify: "Recommendations: Patients with no risk factor and no cardiovascular disease: Non-selective NSAIDs OK (e.g, ibuprofen, naproxen, etc.)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).Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely necessary. Patients at high risk of gastrointestinal events with cardiovascular disease: If GI risk is high the suggestion is for a low-dose Cox-2 plus low dose Aspirin (for cardioprotection) and a PPI. If cardiovascular risk is greater than GI risk the suggestion is naproxyn plus low-dose aspirin plus a PPI. (Laine, 2006) (Scholmerich, 2006) (Nielsen, 2006) (Chan, 2004) (Gold, 2007) (Laine, 2007)"As there is no documentation of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation, or cardiovascular disease in the records available for my review, the injured worker's risk for gastrointestinal events is low, as such, medical necessity cannot be affirmed. The request is not medically necessary.