

Case Number:	CM15-0009074		
Date Assigned:	01/27/2015	Date of Injury:	06/14/2011
Decision Date:	03/20/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/12/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	01/15/2015

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, 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 was a 41 year old male, who sustained a work related injury, June 14, 2011. The injured worker sustained continuous trauma from January 2004 through June 19, 2011, from repetitive job duties. The injured workers chief complaint was right shoulder, left and right knee pain. The injured worker was diagnosed with degenerative joint disease of the left knee with advanced patellafemoral; degenerative arthritis, tear of the medial meniscus of the bilateral knees, left and right knee sprain/strain with internal derangement, right shoulder sprain with impingement syndrome, right rotator cuff tear with internal derangement, anxiety, depression and insomnia. The injured worker also has respiratory function impairment secondary to chemical exposure. The injured worker was treated with injections to the right shoulder, x-rays, physical therapy, arthroscopic surgery of the right shoulder on May 28, 2013, chiropractic services and a meniscectomy of the left knee. On October 6, 2014, the primary treating physician requested authorization for prescriptions for Percocet 5/325mg #120 and Prilosec 20g #30.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Percocet 5/325mg #120: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, criteria for use Page(s): 76-80.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for Percocet, California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines note that it is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function or pain (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement and percent reduction in pain or reduced NRS), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Percocet is not medically necessary.

Prilosec 20mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms and cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk Page(s): 68-69.

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for omeprazole (Prilosec), California MTUS states that proton pump inhibitors are appropriate for the treatment of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID therapy or for patients at risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the patient has complaints of dyspepsia secondary to NSAID use, a risk for gastrointestinal events with NSAID use, or another indication for this medication. In light of the above issues, the currently requested omeprazole (Prilosec) is not medically necessary.