

|                       |              |                              |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Case Number:</b>   | CM15-0052010 |                              |            |
| <b>Date Assigned:</b> | 03/25/2015   | <b>Date of Injury:</b>       | 03/24/2014 |
| <b>Decision Date:</b> | 05/04/2015   | <b>UR Denial Date:</b>       | 02/23/2015 |
| <b>Priority:</b>      | Standard     | <b>Application Received:</b> | 03/19/2015 |

### 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: Pennsylvania, Ohio, 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 27 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/24/2014. The injured worker is currently diagnosed as having 5mm bulging disc at L5-S1. Treatment to date has included physical therapy and medications. In a progress note dated 02/03/2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of low back and buttock pain. The treating physician reported requesting authorization for Prilosec and physical therapy for his low back.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Prilosec 20mg quantity 30:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Non Steroidal Anti Inflammatory Page(s): 68-69.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs and GI Symptoms Page(s): 68.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS recommends use of a proton pump inhibitor or H2 blocker for gastrointestinal prophylaxis if a patient has risk factors for gastrointestinal events. The records

in this case do not document such risk factors or another rationale for this medication; the request is not medically necessary.

**Physical Therapy for the lumbar spine, twice a week for four weeks:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Guidelines Page(s): 99.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Physical Medicine Page(s): 98-99.

**Decision rationale:** MTUS encourages physical therapy with an emphasis on active forms of treatment and patient education. This guideline recommends transition from supervised therapy to active independent home rehabilitation. Given the timeline of this injury and past treatment, the patient would be anticipated to have previously transitioned to such an independent home rehabilitation program. The records do not provide a rationale at this time for additional supervised rather than independent rehabilitation. This request is not medically necessary.