

Case Number:	CM15-0051256		
Date Assigned:	03/24/2015	Date of Injury:	06/20/2006
Decision Date:	05/01/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/19/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	03/18/2015

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 June 20, 2006. The injured worker had reported low back pain. The diagnoses have included lumbar degenerative disc disease, lumbar radiculitis, chronic low back pain, myofascial pain and pain in joints multiple sites. Treatment to date has included medications, radiological studies, electrodiagnostic studies and a home exercise program. Current documentation dated December 8, 2014 notes that the injured worker complained of persistent low back pain with radiation to the right lower extremity. The injured worker reported increasing burning pain and spasms. Examination of the lumbar spine revealed spasms of the paraspinal muscles and stiffness of the lumbar spine. Strength and sensation to light touch was decreased in the right lower extremity. The injured worker was noted to have reflux associated with her medications. The treating physician's plan of care included a request for the medication Omeprazole.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Omeprazole 40mg #30 with 3 refills: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs (Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS
Page(s): 68.

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 a anticoagulant; or (4) high dose/multiple NSAID (e.g., NSAID + 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 okay (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 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). Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal events with no cardiovascular disease: A Cox-2 selective agent plus a PPI if absolutely 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 besides reflux with medications. There is no failure of H2 blockers. 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 certified and is not medically necessary.