

Case Number:	CM15-0147611		
Date Assigned:	08/10/2015	Date of Injury:	04/10/2014
Decision Date:	09/04/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/07/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/29/2015

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:

The injured worker is a 59 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 4-10-2014. He reported back pain. Diagnoses have included lumbar radiculitis. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, acupuncture, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and medication. According to the progress report dated 6-15-2015, the injured worker complained of pain in the upper and lower back. The pain was associated with weakness in the hands, arms, legs and feet. His average pain was rated seven out of ten. Exam of the lumbar spine revealed tenderness to palpation. There was positive lumbar facet loading maneuver bilaterally. The injured worker was advised to discontinue Ibuprofen and start Diclofenac. A urine drug screen was performed with preliminary results positive for opioids; the injured worker denied the use of opioids. Authorization was requested for Prilosec, Diclofenac and a urine drug screen.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Prilosec 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; hypomagnesemia; 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 specific history, identified symptoms, or confirmed GI diagnosis to warrant this medication. The Prilosec 20mg #60 is not medically necessary or appropriate.

Diclofenac XR 100mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), Page 22.

Decision rationale: Anti-inflammatories are the traditional first line of treatment, to reduce pain so activity and functional restoration can resume, but long-term use may not be warranted. Monitoring of NSAID's functional benefit is advised as per Guidelines, long-term use of NSAIDS beyond a few weeks may actually retard muscle and connective tissue healing and increase the risk for heart attack and stroke in patients with or without heart disease, as well as potential for hip fractures even within the first weeks of treatment, increasing with longer use and higher doses of the NSAID. Available reports submitted have not adequately addressed the indication to continue a NSAID for a chronic injury nor have they demonstrated any functional efficacy derived from treatment already rendered. The Diclofenac XR 100mg #30 is not medically necessary or appropriate.

1 urine drug screen: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Drug Testing, page 43.

Decision rationale: Per MTUS Guidelines, urine drug screening is recommended as an option before a therapeutic trial of opioids and for on-going management to differentiate issues of abuse, addiction, misuse, or poor pain control; none of which apply to this patient who has been prescribed long-term opioid for this chronic injury. Presented medical reports from the provider have unchanged chronic severe pain symptoms with unchanged clinical findings of restricted range and tenderness without acute new deficits or red-flag condition changes. Treatment plan remains unchanged with continued medication refills without change in dosing or prescription for chronic pain. There is no report of aberrant behaviors, illicit drug use, and report of acute injury or change in clinical findings or risk factors to support frequent UDS. Documented abuse, misuse, poor pain control, history of unexpected positive results for a non-prescribed scheduled drug or illicit drug or history of negative results for prescribed medications may warrant UDS and place the patient in a higher risk level; however, none are provided. The 1 urine drug screen is not medically necessary or appropriate.