

Case Number:	CM15-0192575		
Date Assigned:	10/06/2015	Date of Injury:	08/05/2014
Decision Date:	11/18/2015	UR Denial Date:	08/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/30/2015

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: Iowa, Illinois, California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive 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 is a 43 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8-5-14. The injured worker has complaints of right foot ankle pain. The injured worker has a pigmented lesion at the medial tibia (ankle) exquisitely sensitive to direct pressure and there are not open lesions. The diagnoses have included joint pain ankle. Treatment to date has included 10 physical therapy sessions; nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and bracing. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) on 11-18-14 revealed superficial edema related to formation or peripheral venous insufficiency and there is a trace in the posterior tibial tendon sheath in the right ankle near symptom localization marker. The original utilization review (8-28-15) non- certified the request for pantoprazole Sod DR 20mg #30. Several documents within the submitted medical records are difficult to decipher.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pantoprazole Sod DR 20mg #30: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: Protonix is the brand name version of Pantoprazole, which is a proton pump inhibitor. MTUS states, "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 an anticoagulant; or (4) High dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + low-dose ASA)." And "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)." ODG states, "If a PPI is used, omeprazole OTC tablets or lansoprazole 24HR OTC are recommended for an equivalent clinical efficacy and significant cost savings. Products in this drug class have demonstrated equivalent clinical efficacy and safety at comparable doses, including esomeprazole (Nexium), lansoprazole (Prevacid), omeprazole (Prilosec), pantoprazole (Protonix), dexlansoprazole (Dexilant), and rabeprazole (Aciphex). (Shi, 2008) A trial of omeprazole or lansoprazole is recommended before Nexium therapy. The other PPIs, Protonix, Dexilant, and Aciphex, should also be second-line. According to the latest AHRQ Comparative Effectiveness Research, all of the commercially available PPIs appeared to be similarly effective. (AHRQ, 2011)" The patient does not meet the age recommendations for increased GI risk. The medical documents provided not indicate history of peptic ulcer, GI bleeding or perforation. Medical records do not indicate that the patient is on ASA, corticosteroids, and/or an anticoagulant; or high dose/multiple NSAID. Additionally per guidelines, Pantoprazole is considered second line therapy and the treating physician has not provided detailed documentation of a failed trial of omeprazole and/or lansoprazole. As such, the request for Pantoprazole Sod DR 20mg #30 is not medically necessary.