

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0193702		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/07/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/20/2006
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/18/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/10/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	10/02/2015

### 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, Oregon, Washington  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

### 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 50 year old female with a date of injury on 6-20-06. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for bilateral upper extremity, hand and wrist pain. Progress report dated 8-5-15 reports complaints of ongoing right shoulder pain and lower back pain. Objective findings: right shoulder tenderness, injection given at this visit to right biceps, she has lower back pain with decreased range of motion. Treatments include: medication, physical therapy, injections, braces, splints left carpal tunnel release and trigger finger release July 2007, right carpal tunnel release August 2007, right shoulder surgery and left trigger finger release September 2009. Request for authorization was made for omeprazole 20 mg quantity 60 with 1 refill, bio-freeze cream 60 gm bottle with 2 refills and ibuprofen 600 mg quantity 60 with 1 refill. Utilization review dated 9-9-15 non-certified omeprazole and bio-freeze and certified ibuprofen.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Omeprazole 20mg #60 with 1 refill:** 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 rationale:** Per the CA MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 68, recommendation for Prilosec is for patients with risk factors for gastrointestinal events. Proton pump inhibitors may be indicated 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). 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 mg four times daily) or (2) a Cox-2 selective agent. The cited records do not demonstrate that the patient is at risk for gastrointestinal events. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**Biofreeze cream 60gm bottle with 2 refills:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Low back, Lumbar & Thoracic (Acute & Chronic) - Biofreeze cryotherapy gel.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Knee Complaints 2004, Section(s): Initial Care.

**Decision rationale:** Per the CA MTUS regarding topical analgesics, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Topical analgesics, page 111-112 "Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended." Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.

**Ibuprofen 600mg #60 with 1 refill:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs (non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): NSAIDs, specific drug list & adverse effects.

**Decision rationale:** According to the CA/MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 67, NSAIDs, specific recommendations are for "Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that

cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008)" There is insufficient evidence to support functional improvement on Ibuprofen or osteoarthritis to warrant usage. Therefore, the request is not medically necessary.