

Case Number:	CM15-0135133		
Date Assigned:	07/23/2015	Date of Injury:	02/12/2007
Decision Date:	08/25/2015	UR Denial Date:	06/11/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/13/2015

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:

This is a 32 year old male with a February 12, 2007 date of injury. A progress note dated April 22, 2015 documents subjective complaints (pain in the lower back which is mostly axial in nature; pain rated at a level of 8/10), objective findings (tenderness to palpation on the posterior lumbar musculature; decreased range of motion of the lumbar spine with obvious muscle guarding; decreased motor strength of the bilateral lower extremities; decreased sensation to pinprick along the posterior lateral thigh and posterior lateral calf in approximately the L5-S1 distribution bilaterally), and current diagnoses (lumbar herniated nucleus pulposus at L4-5 and L5-S1 with associated right side radiculopathy; reactionary depression and anxiety). Treatments to date have included lumbar spine fusion, imaging studies, medications, and pedicle screw hardware blocks. The treating physician requested authorization for Prilosec.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Retrospective Prilosec 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 NSAID
Page(s): 68-72.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on NSAID therapy and proton pump inhibitors (PPI) states: Recommend with precautions as indicated below. Clinicians should weight the indications for NSAIDs against both GI and cardiovascular risk factors. 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 a 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 gastro duodenal lesions. 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 (200 g 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. There is no documentation provided that places this patient at intermediate or high risk that would justify the use of a PPI. There is no mention of current gastrointestinal or cardiovascular disease. For these reasons the criteria set forth above per the California MTUS for the use of this medication has not been met. Therefore the request is not certified.