

Case Number:	CM15-0141508		
Date Assigned:	07/31/2015	Date of Injury:	01/05/2014
Decision Date:	09/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/21/2015

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

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 injured worker is a 45-year-old female who reported an industrial injury on 1-5-2014. Her diagnoses, and or impression, were noted to include: cervical spine sprain-strain with degenerative disc disease, stenosis and right upper extremity radicular symptoms; thoracic sprain-strain with degenerative disc disease and canal stenosis; and lumbar sprain-strain with bilateral lower extremity radicular symptoms, degenerative disc disease, and facet degeneration. No current imaging studies were noted. Her treatments were noted to include: medication management with toxicology studies; and rest from work. The progress notes of 6-3-2015 reported complaints of: severe, constant cervical spine pain with right upper extremity radicular pain; severe lumbar pain with right lower extremity radicular pain; and of gastritis from Ibuprofen use, despite taking Prilosec. No objective findings were noted. The physician's requests for treatments were noted to include the continuation of Omeprazole and the addition of Tramadol to help with symptoms of gastritis.

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.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI Symptoms and Cardiovascular risk, Pages 68-69.

Decision rationale: Proton pump inhibitor (PPI) medication is for treatment of the problems associated with active gastric ulcers, erosive esophagitis, Barrett's esophagitis, or in patients with pathologic hypersecretion diseases. Although preventive treatment is effective for the mentioned diagnosis, studies suggest; however, nearly half of PPI prescriptions are used for unapproved or no indications. Per MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines, the patient does not meet criteria for Omeprazole (Prilosec) namely reserved for patients with history of prior GI bleeding, the elderly (over 65 years), diabetics, and chronic cigarette smokers. Long term use of PPIs have potential increased risks of B12 deficiency; iron deficiency; hypomagnesaemia; susceptibility to pneumonia, enteric infections, fractures, hypergastrinemia and cancer, and cardiovascular effects of myocardial infarction (MI). In the elderly, studies have demonstrated increased risk for Clostridium difficile infection, bone loss, and fractures from long-term use of PPIs. Submitted reports have not described or provided any GI diagnosis that meets the criteria to indicate medical treatment. Review of the records show no documentation of any identified symptoms and confirmed GI diagnosis of criteria above to warrant this medication. The Omeprazole 20mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Tramadol 50mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, specific drug list.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, page(s) 74-96.

Decision rationale: The MTUS Guidelines cite opioid use in the setting of chronic, non-malignant, or neuropathic pain is controversial. Patients on opioids should be routinely monitored for signs of impairment and use of opioids in patients with chronic pain should be reserved for those with improved functional outcomes attributable to their use, in the context of an overall approach to pain management that also includes non-opioid analgesics, adjuvant therapies, psychological support, and active treatments (e.g., exercise). Submitted documents show no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids in accordance to change in pain relief, functional goals with demonstrated improvement in daily activities, decreased in medical utilization or change in functional status. The MTUS provides requirements of the treating physician to assess and document for functional improvement with treatment intervention and maintenance of function that would otherwise deteriorate if not supported. From the submitted reports, there is no demonstrated evidence of specific functional benefit derived from the continuing use of opioids with persistent severe pain for this chronic January 2014 injury without acute flare, new injury, or progressive deterioration. The Tramadol 50mg #60 is not medically necessary and appropriate.