

Case Number:	CM15-0203558		
Date Assigned:	10/20/2015	Date of Injury:	02/03/2014
Decision Date:	12/02/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/16/2015

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:

The injured worker is a 37-year-old female who sustained an industrial injury on 2-3-14. The injured worker reported upper extremity pay. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatments for right and left upper limb carpal tunnel syndrome. Provider documentation dated 10-1-15 noted the work status as modified work. Treatment has included status post right carpal tunnel release (1-18-14), physical therapy, injection therapy, Naproxen, Protonix, Norco, Ibuprofen, Gabapentin and application of ice. Objective findings dated 10-1-15 were notable for bilateral wrist and bilateral elbow tenderness, positive Finkelstein test bilaterally and Tinel test bilaterally at wrists, painful range of motion of elbow. The treating physician indicates that the urine drug testing result (8-21-15) showed no aberration. The original utilization review (9-14-15) denied a request for Pantoprazole-Protonix 20mg #60 and Tramadol-APAP 37.5-325mg #90.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Pantoprazole-Protonix 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator 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, Pain, Proton pump inhibitors.

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

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 an anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID plus 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 mg 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 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 medically necessary.

Tramadol/APAP 37.5/325mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, criteria for use. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Pain, Opioids, specific drug list.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids for chronic pain.

Decision rationale: When to Continue Opioids (a) If the patient has returned to work (b) If the patient has improved functioning and pain (Washington, 2002) (Colorado, 2002) (Ontario, 2000) (VA/DoD, 2003) (Maddox-AAPM/APS, 1997) (Wisconsin, 2004) (Warfield, 2004). The long-term use of this medication class is not recommended per the California MTUS unless there documented evidence of benefit with measurable outcome measures and improvement in function. There is no documented significant decrease in objective pain measures such as VAS scores for significant periods of time. There are no objective measures of improvement of function or how the medication improves activities. His work status is not mentioned. Therefore, not all criteria for the ongoing use of opioids have been met and the request is not medically necessary.

