

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0131439		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/17/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/21/2010
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/13/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	06/23/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/07/2015

### 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: North Carolina

Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

### 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 63 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on July 21, 2010. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lumbar herniated nucleus pulposus (HNP), lumbar stenosis, right meniscal tear, left knee arthroscopy, left knee arthropathy and possible meniscal tear. Treatment to date has included arthroscopy, injection and medication. A progress note dated April 7, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of increased right knee pain. Physical exam notes minimal effusion with tenderness on palpation and positive McMurray test. There is a request for ibuprofen.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Ibuprofen 800 mg #60 (Refill 0 of 5):** Overturned

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAID  
Page(s): 68-72.

**Decision rationale:** The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy states: Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) This medication is recommended for the shortest period of time and at the lowest dose possible. The shortest period of time is not defined in the California MTUS. The requested medication is within the maximum dosing guidelines per the California MTUS. Therefore the request is certified. Therefore, the requested treatment is medically necessary.