

Case Number:	CM15-0131487		
Date Assigned:	07/17/2015	Date of Injury:	08/19/2013
Decision Date:	08/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/08/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	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: New Jersey, Alabama, California
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 (IW) is a 45-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 08/19/2013. Diagnoses include cervicgia/neck pain; bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome; overuse syndrome, hypermobility syndrome; lumbalgia/displacement of lumbar intervertebral disc without myelopathy; displacement of cervical intervertebral disc without myelopathy; likely fibromyalgia versus myofascial pain syndrome; and sleep issue. Treatment to date has included medication, yoga, massage, stretching, TENS unit, trigger point injections, gym membership with pool use, psychiatric care and acupuncture. According to the progress notes dated 5/27/15, the IW reported neck pain, upper back pain and bilateral hand pain rated 6/10. She continued having difficulty falling asleep. Current medications included Cymbalta, Gabapentin, Diclofenac and Omeprazole. TENS and acupuncture reportedly were beneficial. On examination, there was loss of cervical lordosis. Cervical range of motion was 45 degrees flexion and 45 degrees extension. The cervical spine was diffusely tender to palpation. A request was made for Omeprazole 20mg, #60; Lidopro ointment, #1; and acupuncture, six sessions.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Omeprazole 20mg, #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms & Cardiovascular Risk Page(s): 68-69.

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

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, Omeprazole is indicated when NSAID are used in patients with intermediate or high risk for gastrointestinal events. The risk for gastrointestinal events are: (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). Recent studies tend to show that H. Pylori does not act synergistically with NSAIDs to develop gastroduodenal lesions. There is no documentation that the patient has GI issue that requires the use of Prilosec. There is no documentation in the patient's chart supporting that she is at intermediate or high risk for developing gastrointestinal events. Therefore, the request for Omeprazole 20mg #60 is not medically necessary.

Lidopro Ointment #1: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS, in Chronic Pain Medical Treatment, guidelines section Topical Analgesics (page 111); topical analgesics are largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Many agents are combined to other pain medications for pain control. There is limited research to support the use of many of these agents. Furthermore, according to MTUS guidelines, any compounded product that contains at least one drug or drug class that is not recommended is not recommended. Lido Pro (capsaicin, menthol and methyl salicylate and lidocaine) contains capsaicin a topical analgesic and lidocaine not recommended by MTUS. In addition, in this case, there is no supporting evidence of objective functional improvement to support continued use of LidoPro cream. Based on the above, Lido Pro ointment is not medically necessary.

Acupuncture, #6 (Unspecified body part): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, acupuncture is considered in knee, back, ankle, and upper extremities complaints. "Acupuncture" is used as an option when pain medication is reduced or not tolerated, it may be used as an adjunct to physical rehabilitation and/or surgical intervention to hasten functional recovery. It is the insertion and removal of filiform needles to stimulate acupoints (acupuncture points). Needles may be inserted, manipulated, and retained for a period of time. Acupuncture can be used to reduce pain, reduce inflammation, increase blood flow, increase range of motion, decrease the side effect of medication-induced nausea, promote relaxation in an anxious patient, and reduce muscle spasm.

(c) Frequency and duration of acupuncture or acupuncture with electrical stimulation may be performed as follows: (1) Time to produce functional improvement: 3 to 6 treatments. (2) Frequency: 1 to 3 times per week. (3) Optimum duration: 1 to 2 months. (d) Acupuncture treatments may be extended if functional improvement is documented as defined in Section 9792.20 (ef). In this case, there is no clear documentation of the efficacy of previous use of acupuncture. There is no reduction in medication usage and/or significant functional improvement. Therefore, the request for Acupuncture, #6 (Unspecified body part) is not medically necessary.