

Case Number:	CM15-0052605		
Date Assigned:	03/26/2015	Date of Injury:	03/27/2012
Decision Date:	05/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	02/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	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: Indiana

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational 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 38 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 03/27/2012. She has reported injury to the right knee and lower back. The diagnoses have included internal derangement of knee, status post right knee surgery on 06/25/2012; and lumbago. Treatment to date has included medications, diagnostics, bracing, Hyalgan injections, TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) unit, and surgical intervention. Medications have included Gabapentin, Norco, Nalfon, Pantoprazole, and Lidopro ointment. A progress note from the treating physician, dated 12/22/2014, documented a follow-up visit with the injured worker. Currently, the injured worker complains of right knee pain and low back pain; the right knee gives out on a regular basis and she has been falling quite often; and takes medications to be functional. Objective findings have included tenderness along the right knee with extension; and pain across the low back with muscle spasms, stiffness, and tightness. The treatment plan has included the request for Lidopro ointment 121 grams; and Pantoprazole 20 mg #60.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Lidopro ointment 121grams: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Topical Analgesics Page(s): 111-113. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Compound creams.

Decision rationale: MTUS and ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, 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. Lidopro is a topical medication containing Lidocaine, Capsaicin, Menthol, and Methyl Salicylate. ODG recommends usage of topical analgesics as an option, but also further details primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. The medical documents do not indicate failure of antidepressants or anticonvulsants. MTUS states, 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. MTUS recommends topical capsaicin only as an option in patients who have not responded or are intolerant to other treatments. There is no indication that the patient has failed oral medication or is intolerant to other treatments. Additionally, ODG states Topical OTC pain relievers that contain menthol, methyl salicylate, or capsaicin, may in rare instances cause serious burns, a new alert from the FDA warns. ODG only comments on menthol in the context of cryotherapy for acute pain, but does state Topical OTC pain relievers that contain menthol, methyl salicylate, or capsaicin, may in rare instances cause serious burns, a new alert from the FDA warns. MTUS states regarding topical Salicylate, Recommended. Topical salicylate (e.g., Ben-Gay, methyl salicylate) is significantly better than placebo in chronic pain. (Mason-BMJ, 2004) See also Topical analgesics; & Topical analgesics, compounded. In this case, lidocaine is not supported for topical use per guidelines. As such, the request for lidopro lotion is not medically necessary.

Pantoparazole 20mg #60: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDs; GI protection Page(s): 68-69. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic), NSAIDs, GI symptoms & cardiovascular risk.

Decision rationale: 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 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 establish the patient has experienced GI discomfort, but is nonspecific and does 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 get 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 is not medically necessary.